

THE
AMERICAN
CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
REVIEW

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem. quia malum est homini ut eum
veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive
confitentem. S. AUG. EPIST. ccxxxviii. AD PASCENT.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

VOLUME XL.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1915.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

PHILADELPHIA :

610 SOUTH WASHINGTON SQUARE.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL XL.—JULY, 1915—No. 159

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND ANTI-CLERICALISM.

ONE of the most lamentable results commonly attributed to the great French Revolution has been the cleavage, or estrangement, between the Church and democracy. It is at once a problem and a paradox. The problem is to discover its real cause and to find a satisfactory solution, and the paradox is that it is a contradiction in terms to assume an antagonism between Catholicism and democracy. A Church primarily democratic in its origin and constitution, and which is more of a great Christian Republic than a monarchy, cannot be out of harmony with democracy. The Church has relations with all forms of Government, with non-Catholic as well as Catholic States; it has, for instance, equal freedom of action in the countries which come under the sway of Protestant England as well as in the United States, a pure democratic Republic, even more than in some so-called Catholic countries. Although no quarrel can be found between the theory of the Revolution and that of the Church, as Mr. Belloc observes, an active quarrel did, in fact, spring up between the Revolution in action and the authorities of Catholicism—a quarrel which a hundred years has not appeased, but accentuated. He traces it to the Civil Constitution of the clergy in 1790, which he calls the true historical point of departure from which we must date the beginning of this profound debate between the Revolution and Catholicism.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1915, by J. P. Turner, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

But we must go farther back to find the active genesis of anti-clericalism. Its origin dates from the decadence of faith and morals and the spirit of skepticism which pervaded the Church in France during the eighteenth century, when Voltaire, its evil genius, led the intellectual revolt against Christianity and lax Catholics enjoyed and encouraged the gibes and jeers of which a scoffing generation made the clergy the butt—not knowing that in sapping the foundations of belief, they were sapping the foundations of the throne and undermining the whole edifice of Church and State. The Church was then dominated by Gallicanism; it allied it with the monarchy, with which, in the minds of the people, it was confounded in the sequel. This compromising and too close alliance; the monopolizing of all the higher ecclesiastical offices by the *noblesse* for their personal aggrandizement and profit; the intrusion of worldly-minded and often loose-living scions of the noble families into the priesthood and into prelacies, without even the pretense of a vocation, like De Retz, Talleyrand, De Rancé (before he became the austere reformer of La Trappe) and many others; the endowing of mere youths with abbeys held in *commendam*, ruled or misruled by relaxed deputies, while the titular abbots drew the revenues and spent them in Paris or Versailles in the pursuit of pleasure; the scandals and abuses to which this unworthy betrayal of a sacred trust gave rise, and which brought the sacerdotal order into disrepute—these things, coupled with the neglect of their social duties by what were called the *classes dirigeantes*, and the wretched condition of the masses of the people, steeped in ignorance and debased by servitude, precluded the dreadful cataclysm of the eighteenth century. The Church shared in the odium and ruin which the great French Revolution visited upon the governing orders, civil and ecclesiastical. “The very fact that the Church had become in France an unshakable national institution,” writes Mr. Belloc, “chilled the vital source of Catholicism. Not only did the hierarchy stand in a perpetual suspicion of the Roman See and toy with the conception of national independence, but they and all the official organization of French Catholicism put the security of the national establishment and its intimate attachment to the general political structure of the State far beyond the sanctity of Catholic dogma or the practice of Catholic morals. . . . Wit, good verse, sincere enthusiasm, a lucid exposition of whatever in the human mind perpetually rebels against transcendental affirmations, were allowed every latitude and provoked no effective reply. But overt acts of disrespect to ecclesiastical authority were punished with rigor. While in the wealthy, the bureaucratic and the governing classes, to ridicule the faith was an attitude taken for granted,

seriously to attack the privileges or position of its ministers was ungentlemanly and was not allowed. It did not shock the hierarchy that one of its apostolic members should be a witty atheist; that another should go hunting upon Corpus Christi, nearly upset the Blessed Sacrament in his gallop and forget what day it was when the accident occurred. The Bishops found nothing remarkable in seeing a large proportion of their body to be loose livers, or in some of them openly presenting their friends to their mistresses, as might be done by any great noble round them. That a diocese or any other spiritual charge should be divorced from its titular chief seemed to them as natural as does to us the absence from his modern regiment of some titular foreign colonel. Unquestioned also by the Bishop were the poverty, the neglect and the uninstruction of the parish clergy; nay—and this is by far the principal feature—the abandonment of religion by all but a very few of the French millions no more affected the ecclesiastical officials of the time than does the starvation of our poor affect, let us say, one of our professional politicians. It was a thing simply taken for granted. The reader must seize that moribund condition of the religious life of France upon the eve of the Revolution, for it is at once imperfectly grasped by the general run of historians, and is also the only fact which thoroughly explains what followed. The swoon of the faith in the eighteenth century is the negative foundation upon which the strange religious experience of the French was about to rise. France, in the generation before the Revolution, was passing through a phase in which the Catholic faith was at a lower ebb than it had ever been since the preaching and establishment of it in Gaul.”¹

The semi-independence claimed and exercised by Gallicanism, when even a Bossuet appealed to the King against a mandate from Rome, had in it the germs of schism, in which the civic oath enforced under the Civil Constitution, to which Louis XVI. gave his reluctant consent, involved four of the Bishops and a large number, though a minority, of the time-serving and timorous clergy. The refusal of its non-juring priests to take that oath, which constituted an arbitrary infringement of the Church's autonomous discipline by a Power external to it, arrayed them in an attitude of apparent hostility to the democratic government which displaced the monarchical *régime*—it identified the Church as a corporate body with the court and reactionary intrigues. Many took it in ignorance or good faith, but no Catholic, with full consciousness of its scope and purport, could take it without being disloyal to the Holy See, which, by the Papal brief “*Caritas*,” had condemned the Civil Constitution of the clergy. The non-jurors paid the penalty of their fidelity in the

¹ “The French Revolution.” By Hilaire Belloc, M. A., pp. 225-7.

proscriptions and persecution which followed, and their successors to this day are paying it in the partial ostracism to which anti-clericalism subjects them. The chief events of the Revolution have passed into history, but the heritage of it has not. The Reign of Terror in Paris, Lyons, Bordeaux, Toulon and Nantes, the execution of Louis XVI.—an expiatory victim of atonement for the vices and wrongdoings, the faults and follies of his immediate predecessors—and other incidents of the great overturn have been forgotten, but the deep-rooted prejudice against the ecclesiastical order still lingers. Prejudice is an impalpable thing with which it is hard to grapple, but time, which brings with it many disillusionings, will eventually dispel this illusion. The great European war now being waged is helping to remove it. If it has arrayed nations in deadly conflict against one another, it has, as a counterpoise, united classes hitherto separated—it has brought priests and people together in a way that possibly no other event could. If civil war drove them apart in the eighteenth century, war in this twentieth century has drawn them together. Priests and laymen, clericals and anti-clericals have been fighting side by side, braving death and danger in the same cause, serving in the rank and file or leading companies and regiments into action, while Catholic chaplains in hundreds are ministering to the spiritual needs of the combatants at the risk of their lives.

It is computed that there are 20,000 soldier-priests in the French army, and that over 600 of these have fallen at the front. Ecclesiastics who have filled high offices in the Church are serving as privates, their inferiors in the priesthood being often their military superiors. A well-known anti-clerical general chose priests for difficult ambulance work on the ground that they are always steady under fire, indifferent to death, untiringly energetic and unfailingly cheerful. French and English papers record acts of heroism performed by these priest-combatants which have impressed and wrung admiration from irreligious men in the ranks and occasionally led many who had strayed away from the Church of their baptism to return to the devout practice of religion. Never have so many Catholic chaplains been permitted to exercise their ministry on the battlefield, with the consoling result that brave fellows by the thousand have fearlessly faced death with greater courage, constancy and confidence after previously making their confessions and receiving Communion, while among the survivors there is a general reawakening of faith which inspires hope for the future. With these examples of moral and physical courage before them, with this close association of priests and people sharing the same hardships, braving the same dangers and fighting side by side in a common

cause, France must recognize that the Catholic religion is not only compatible with patriotism, but intensifies and strengthens it. This war should make an end of anti-clericalism. Instead of "*le clericalisme, voila l'ennemi!*" in Gambetta's deceptive phrase, it should now be "*le clericalisme, voila l'ami!*" Unless Frenchmen are devoid of all sense of gratitude, they can no longer harbor suspicions of the loyalty of Bishops and priests who have so nobly and unselfishly served their country. The same change of sentiment should take place from the same causes in Italy, which has at length thrown in its lot with France and England. There are 10,000 priests in the ranks of the Italian army and hundreds of Catholic chaplains. Parties have disappeared or effaced themselves and the whole peninsula from end to end is united as it never was before in all its checkered history.

This should lead statesmen and politicians in France and Italy who, like the present French Premier, have assumed an attitude of hostility towards the Church, to reconsider their position. As has been pointed out, between the Church, *qua* Church, and the democratic movement which gave birth to the Revolution, there is no irreconcilability. Pope Leo XIII. removed any doubt on that point when by his far-reaching and far-sighted rally policy he recognized the French Republic as the expression of the will of the French people. It is to be hoped that the Triple Entente, by bringing English and French statesmen into close and confidential relations, will indoctrinate the latter with saner views of liberty and wiser methods of government; that they will be at length aroused from the nightmare of anti-clericalism and give up fighting with shadows now that they had something more substantial than shadows to fight against on the western battle front.

The dead past has buried its dead. The abuses of the old *régime* have long since been swept away, and the attempts to resuscitate it have failed. The Republic has triumphed; it is erect and visible; the old monarchy is only a memory. Although even at this distance of time the human mind recoils horror-stricken from the recital of the atrocities perpetrated by the first revolutionists, by homicidal maniacs like Marat, Carrier, Collot d'Herbois, much as one deplors the sanguinary excesses of the French Revolution, the frenzy and fury with which the maddened multitude, excited by demagogues, revolted against the Bourbon dynasty and overthrew throne and altar, it was not entirely disastrous. "The very violence of the modern reaction towards Catholicism," says Mr. Belloc, "has exaggerated the revolutionary persecution, and in doing so has made men forget that, apart from other evidence of the decline of religion, it is obvious that persecution could never have arisen with-

out a strong and continuous historical backing. You could not have had a Diocletian in the thirteenth century, with the spirit of the Crusaders just preceding him; you could not have had Henry VIII. if the England of the fifteenth century just preceding him had been an England devoted to the monastic profession. And you could not have had the revolutionary fury against the Catholic Church in France if the preceding generation had been actively Catholic even in a considerable proportion."

As Carlyle philosophically observes: "In the huge mass of evil, as it rolls and swells, there is ever some good working imprisoned—working towards deliverance and triumph." This is to be ascribed to that providential governance, or oversight, which, happily, will not abandon humanity at any epoch solely a prey to the forces of evil. The French Revolution illustrates this. It accomplished the deliverance of an oppressed and misgoverned people. It found the French peasant a serf; it made him a free man. The peasantry had been practically enslaved by the Crown and the aristocracy. The tiller of the soil had to quit his own fields and leave them untilled to slave as a laborer for the King or the nobles. The peasants had to be up all night betimes to beat the castle moat with long rods to prevent the frogs from croaking and thus disturb the slumbers of the *seigneur* after a day spent in the pleasures of the chase or a night's ball. In the old times the land belonged to the feudal baron, who had power to compel the villagers to work for the embellishment of his own grounds, so that the peasant had never a week he could call his own. The old French *noblesse* formed a caste as distinct from the people as the whites in America from the Negroes, only the color line in the United States is not so sharply drawn as the line of demarcation between the *seigneur* and the *roturier*, the noble and the plebeian, was. The nobles were a privileged order, and their privileges oppressively hampered and harassed the rural population. Until August 4, 1789, there existed a privilege called *le droit de colombier*, in virtue of which the nobles had the exclusive right to keep pigeons, which were free to feed unmolested on the peasants' corn. This accounts for the numerous pigeon-cotes adjoining French châteaux, reminders to the present generation of the unforgotten past. Then the noble had his *droit de garenne*, or right of keeping an unlimited rabbit-warren, the prolific occupants of which also fed on his neighbors' produce. Besides, he had an exclusive right to all other game. But, worst of all and most oppressive and exacting, was the *corvée*, or forced labor, which reduced the peasantry to the level of convicts. The nobles had the power to command *corvées* for the simple embellishment of their estates and grounds. They could compel the peas-

antry to leave their fields at the very seasons when it was most urgent that they should labor in them, in order to lay out ornamental grounds about the château or to build mills and baking-ovens.

Among the monopolies of the nobles, it is curious to note, was the baking and supply of bread. The peasant was not allowed to bake his own bread; the noble baked for him and fixed the price of the loaf. Neither was the peasant free to garner his own grain; his lord kept it for him and charged what he liked for storage. In addition to the *corvée seigneuriale*, there was the *corvée royale*. The King's intendants had power to impose the *corvée* at will for anything that might be construed into "the service of the King"—an elastic phrase, subject to a rather free interpretation. When they wanted a road, the peasants were impressed to make it; when barracks were needed, peasant labor was requisitioned. When a regiment was drafted from one garrison town to another, the peasants had to transport all the military baggage; when convicts were sent to the hulks at Toulon, the peasants had to provide horses and carts at every halting stage on the journey. They were taken from the most necessary labors of agriculture for all these compulsory and unpaid services. The fields had to be left untilled or unsown or the harvest ungarnered in order to give their unrequited labor to the nobles or the State. They had to labor almost without cessation and dare not refuse. The slaves on a Southern plantation before the war of secession were not more at the beck and call of their owners than the French peasantry under the old *régime*. The Revolution changed all that, and the French peasant of to-day knows it—knows it as well as the Irish peasant or tenant farmer knows that the land-purchase acts of the British Parliament have relieved or are relieving him of the thralldom of landlordism and its attendant evils, of rack-rents, ruthless evictions and wholesale clearances. Thousands of French peasants are land-owners themselves; thousands of Irish peasants or farmers are becoming owners of their own holdings. The change which was wrought in one country by a great social upheaval and much bloodshed—needlessly shed—is being wrought in the other by process of law, by a bloodless revolution. The French peasant can now work all the year round on his farm. He keeps his own grain, has no storage to pay any noble; he bakes his own bread and has not to go to the mill or bakery of any grasping lord, without being at liberty to go elsewhere, even in times of greatest pressure, having to wait his turn and obliged to take what he got, no matter how the grain was ground, the bread baked or the price fixed. He pays his taxes and is free to-day. The noble at the château has no compulsory power over him, unless he be his landlord, and even then his power is legally limited. Using

that thrift which is a distinguishing characteristic of the French, he can save money, knowing that he can keep the fruits of his own labor for himself and his children. "The French peasantry of to-day are, on the whole," says Mr. Hamerton, who made a close study of rural France, "as happy a class of people as their forefathers were wretched, and the improvement is simply due to those political reforms which have left the natural prudence and industry of the class full liberty to lead it to prosperity."²

It is the contrast between the past and the present, between France under the Bourbons and the self-governing France of to-day, which makes the French peasant Conservative-republican. Ownership has a steadying and conservative influence. It is the proletarian populace of the cities, the theorists and dreamers, the restless spirits who long for change, who hope to win a trick for themselves by the reshuffling of the cards, who make the later or minor revolutions, who "see red." The rural population recoil from what has been called "the White Terror," a reactionary revival or resuscitation of the dead past. One of the strongest reasons for the republicanism of the peasantry is that they fear a royalist restoration would lead the revival of the *corvées* and other obnoxious usages; and as they have been taught to identify legitimism with Catholicism, anti-clerical politicians used to play upon their fears and make party capital of them. But now that legitimism is as dead as Queen Anne, those fears should vanish.

The French peasant, like the Irish peasant, is shrewd and intelligent in his own way, though his mental purview may be narrow. Justin McCarthy said it would be impossible to find an absolutely ignorant Irishman, and the same may safely be averred of the French rural classes. The French peasant compares favorably with his English counterpart. "Talk to a French peasant," says Hamerton, "and he will enter into your ideas if he can; talk to Hodge, and he will stare at you." The French peasant is cast in a very different mould from the Frenchman of the large towns or cities. Rigid customs, handed on from sire to son and from son to grandson for ages, rule and regulate their lives. Education on modern lines and contact with city life breaks the mould. "The only way for the educated son of a peasant to remain rustic," says the writer quoted, "is to become a priest; then he can live in relations with the peasantry which are at the same time familiar enough for him to feel no painful separation, and yet of a kind which keeps him distinct and independent and allows him to read and think, with the infinite advantage of solitude, at will. . . . The rural French customs

² "Round My House: Notes of Rural Life in France in Peace and War." By Philip Gilbert Hamerton.

imply the constant practice of very great virtues—temperance, frugality, industry, patience, self-control and self-denial. In all these virtues the peasant acts as none but a saint or hero could act if he were alone, but he is wonderfully sustained and encouraged by the custom of his class.”

It was out of pious peasant-homes where simple virtues were practiced and the traditions of a thousand years preserved came such type of priests as St. Vincent de Paul and the Blessed Jean Baptiste Vianney, the *curé* who made the village of Ars famous by his holiness, his homely homilies and his unwearied devotedness to the confessional, the centre from whence radiated an influence felt by all who came in contact with him, for virtue went out from him as of old it went forth from One who emerged from an obscure dwelling in Judea to morally transform a world.

“It has been my fortune,” writes Mr. Hamerton, “to know a good many French priests and to be on terms of intimacy—indeed I may say friendship—with two or three. They are generally most respectable men, devoted to their work, living contentedly on wonderfully small incomes. . . . I well remember visiting quite recently, in the course of a pedestrian excursion with a party of friends, a curious little village perched on the very crest of a steep hill 1,500 feet high. There was an interesting Romanesque church, and service was going on when we entered it. At the close of the service the *curé* began catechizing and instructing a class of children, but he very kindly sent a man to say that if we would go and rest ourselves in the *presbytère* he would join us when his work was over. His home was quite a poor man’s cottage, without the least pretension to comfort. Another messenger came from the *curé’s* to say how much he regretted not to be able to offer us a glass of wine after our ascent of the hill, but he had no wine in the house. An English reader will realize with difficulty the degree of destitution which this implies in a wine-producing country like France, where common wine is not looked upon at all in the light of a luxury, but is considered, except by the frugal peasants, a part of necessary food. ‘We are expecting,’ his servant said, ‘a little cask of white wine from the low country, but it is a long time in reaching us.’ One of us observed ‘that the *curé* must be very hungry, for we knew that he had eaten nothing yet, as he had said Mass and we thought he would have done better to get his *déjeuner* before teaching the children. ‘This is his *déjeuner*,’ the woman said, lifting a plate from a basin that she kept warm upon the hearth. It contained nothing but mallow tea. The good *curé*, who was as thin as he well could be, was, in fact, one of those admirable priests who are so absorbed in the duties and charities of their calling that they

forget self altogether. Priests of that saintly character are looked upon by the more worldly clergy as innocent idealists, whose proper sphere is an out-of-the-way village. It is said by those who know the Church better than I do that they very seldom get much ecclesiastical advancement. Their self-denial is sometimes almost incredible. The following instances, which have been narrated to me by people who knew the *curés* themselves, will convey some idea of it:

"My first story shall be about a *curé* who was formerly incumbent of the parish where my home is situated. He is dead now, but when he was alive he was not remarkable for attention to personal appearance. His wardrobe (except, of course, the vestments in which he officiated) consisted of one old black cotton cassock, and when he was asked to dinner, it was his custom to ink over those places which seemed to need a little restoration, after which process he considered himself presentable in good society. This, however, was not the opinion of his brethren, who were men of the world. One day the Bishop invited him to dinner, so our good *curé* went in his old cassock, even to the Bishop's palace itself. The priests of the episcopal court drew the prelate's attention to that cassock, and the wearer of it incurred a severe reprimand for his *mauvaise tenue*. The ladies of his parish, who loved and respected him (with good reason), were much pained when they heard of this and subscribed to buy him a good new silk cassock to be worn on state occasions, especially at the Bishop's table. For a short time the *curé* remained in possession of this garment, but no invitation came from the Bishop. At last somebody told His Grandeur that the poor priest had now the means of making a decent appearance, so he invited him again. 'Alas, Monseigneur,' was the reply, 'a month since I could have come, for I had the new cassock, but now I possess it no longer, and so I cannot come!' On inquiry it turned out that some poor little boys who had come to be catechized had ragged waistcoats and could not make a decent appearance at church, so it struck the *curé* that the cassock was big enough to make several capital waistcoats for little boys, and he had employed it for that purpose to the advantage of *their* appearance, but to the detriment of his own.

"My next story, which is also perfectly authentic, concerns a priest who is still (1908) alive, and so incorrigibly charitable as to be the despair of his good sister, who tries in vain to keep him decent. He does not live quite close to my house, but I have authentic tidings of him from a very near neighbor of his who comes to see me occasionally. One day at the beginning of winter some years ago a lady came to this priest's house to see him on business, but, as he was absent, she had to wait for his return. The first

thing that struck him on entering his room was that the lady looked miserably cold. 'How cold you do look, madame!' he said. 'I wish I had a fire to warm you; but the fact is, I have no fuel.' When the lady went away she told the story to her friends, and they plotted together to buy the *curé* a comfortable little stove and a cartload of wood, which comforts were duly sent to the *presbytère*. Some weeks afterwards, in the severe winter weather, the lady thought she would go and see how the *curé's* stove acted and whether he was as comfortable as she had expected. On this visit the following little conversation took place:

"*Lady*: The weather is so bitterly cold that I thought I would come to see whether your stove warmed your room properly.

"*Curé*: Thank you, thank you! The stove you were so good as to give me is really excellent. It warms a room capitally.

"*Lady* (who by this time has penetrated into the chamber, which is the *curé's* bedroom and sittingroom in one): But, I declare, you have no fire at all! And the stove is not here! Have you set it up somewhere else?

"*Curé* (much embarrassed): Yes, it is set up elsewhere. The fact is, there was a very poor woman who was delivered of a child at the time you sent me the stove, and she had no fire, so I gave it to her.

"*Lady*: And the cartload of wood?

"*Curé*: Oh! of course, she must have fuel for her stove, so I gave her the wood, too.

"It is the simple truth that the good Christian man was quietly sitting without a spark of fire all through a bitter winter, because, in his opinion, the poor woman needed warmth more than he did. The same *curé* came home sometimes without a shirt—the shirt having been given to some very poor parishioner—and at least once he came back without shoes for the same reason. At one time he had a small private fortune—need I say that it has long since disappeared? He spent a good deal of it in restoring an old chapel which had been abandoned to ruin, but is now used again for public worship."

Of another *curé* who lives within a few miles of the one just mentioned, the author states:

"This one does not give his shirt or his shoes, does not reach the heroism of charity, but is a fine sample of humane feelings which professional customs have never been able to deaden. He has a poor parish—I mean a parish where there is a good deal of really severe poverty amongst the inhabitants—and he was complaining on one occasion of the extreme narrowness of his means. 'But you have a good *causel*, some one observed. 'You have a populous

parish, with plenty of funerals.' 'Alas!' he answered, 'it is true enough that there are plenty of funerals in my parish, but how can I charge burial fees to poor widows and orphans who have nothing left to live upon or to poor workmen who have had sickness in the house till they cannot pay their way?' English and American travelers on the Continent of Europe see the splendid ceremonies in the cathedrals and the gorgeous processions in the streets, but they do not see the obscurity acts of charity and self-denial which are only known to the local inhabitants, and not even to all these. From seeing the ceremonies and nothing else the foreigner readily misconceives their relation to the daily life of the rural clergy, which is simple enough in its poverty and isolation and is often dignified by an earnest endeavor to realize the Christian ideal. The rural clergy are, I believe, as respectable a class of men, from the moral point of view, as can be found anywhere. . . . A priest who has a large country parish has a great deal of walking to do. The one whom I mentioned as being the *curé* of a village perched on the crest of a hill 1,500 feet high descends and ascends that hill every time he goes out on his parish work, which he does every day. . . .

Every village has its funny stories about *curés*, either living or dead. The following would supply a good subject for a picture: In a hill village well known to me, where the hillsides slope down in very rapid declivities, diversified by grassy places and stony places, there lived a few years ago a venerable old *curé*, who, to eke out his wretched little income, kept a few animals, and amongst the rest a couple of goats. He used to take these goats out with him upon the hillside, and while they were feeding he read his Breviary, but whilst he was reading the goats sometimes strayed inconveniently far, and the inconvenience was all the greater to him that he could not see very well, so that it was not easy to find them. At last, however, he hit upon a capital expedient which seemed to reconcile completely the two occupations he wished to carry on at the same time. With two strong and rather long cords he tied one goat to one of his ankles and the other to the other, after which he sat down on the hillside and read his Breviary without much interruption from the animals, which soon knew the length of their tether. This device succeeded so well that the *curé* was rather proud of it and might often be seen on the hillside in this position on a fine afternoon. At length, however, an incident occurred which showed that the priest's invention might, under certain circumstances, be dangerous. Some huntsmen came suddenly over the brow of the hill with a small pack of beagles. The goats were much alarmed at these strange dogs and set off at full speed down

the steep slope, over the grassy places and the stony places, dragging the poor old *curé* after them. He was not killed, but he found that mode of traveling decidedly disagreeable.

"This good priest's successor, who is now living in the same parish, found that people complained of the length of his sermons, so he said to his old woman-servant: 'When I get a-going, I never know when to stop; you should make me a sign when I have preached long enough, and then I would stop.' After that the woman made her sign accordingly, and the *curé* broke off abruptly with the usual form. The effect, however, was strange sometimes, as on one occasion, when he said to his parishioners, 'If you do not conduct yourselves better, the devil will certainly take you.' Here the preacher glanced at his servant, who made the sign agreed upon, so he ended at once with the customary set phrase, *C'est la grace que je vous souhaite.*"³

This independent testimony of an English Protestant to the worth and work of the French rural clergy is creditable alike to the eulogist and the eulogized. Although he is somewhat sarcastic in his comments on the honors given to a French Bishop, who is addressed as "*Monseigneur*," as if he were a prince of the blood, or "*Votre Grandeur*," which, he says, "certainly expresses the idea of greatness more directly than any other form of address which human servility ever invented," he admits, however, that the splendor with which he is surrounded "is rather sacerdotal than worldly," and that a prelate may be really humble in spite of the external state and grandeur of the episcopal dignity inherited from long-established customs.

"There is one," he writes, "not many miles from my house who tries to realize what may have been the earliest and purest ideal of a Bishop, and who, I think, will not be soon forgotten as men in his station generally are. He is singularly and wonderfully unworldly, absolutely careless of those arts by which an exalted position is defended and maintained, rightly disdainful of the trifles and of the time-wasting ceremonies of society, always ready to give time and strength to real work that may lead to good, and to *payer de sa personne* when an indolent prelate would either do nothing or send a substitute. A young man I knew was dying of consumption. He was very religious, and in his last hours had a wish to possess some little thing that had been blest by the Pope. The priest who attended him had nothing of the kind, but reflected that as the Bishop had lately been at Rome, he was the right person to apply to. So the priest went and told his story. Before he had mentioned the

³ The French equivalent of the familiar English peroration, "which is a blessing I wish you all."

name of the young man the Bishop had put his hat on and said: 'I will take it myself to him at once; where does he live? Show me the way.' As it happened, the dying youth was a young gentleman, but he might have been in the humblest rank. The Bishop did not ask who or what he was. On the other hand, great ladies were rather disappointed because this strange prelate gave so little time to society. When they called upon him he had the air of a busy man unpleasantly interrupted, and they said he was ill-bred. 'So much the better,' was his observation; 'that is just what I want them to think; they will waste less of my time.' 'Votre Grandeur will come to my drawing-rooms,' said one *grande dame*. 'No,' was the frank reply, 'I am too busy, and I don't much approve of drawing-room priests, or dining-room priests, either; there are too many of both sorts.' One rainy day he went on foot to a convent, and when he left there was a great fuss to find the Bishop's umbrella. The Sisters emulated each other's zeal. 'I think I can find it better than you can,' he said with a smile and fished up an old cotton one. Every ladies' priest has a silk one, as a matter of course, so the Sister had been misled by the material. Some amusing stories of his kindly ways ran about the diocese and made friends for him amongst reasonable people, while they earned for him the grave disapproval of proud and stuck-up people who believe in artificial dignity. One day he passed a tanner's yard, thought he should like to see the processes of the unsavory trade, and so entered and talked familiarly with the workmen. On leaving he gave them twenty francs to drink, which was much blamed by evil tongues as an encouragement to inebriety, but he accompanied his present with the following little speech: 'This to drink the Bishop's health, and now let me tell you how a Bishop's health ought to be drunk. You must not go and drink the money at the wineshop and leave your wives all by themselves, but you must buy a few bottles of really good, sound wine and drink it in your own homes and let your wives have their fair share.' It is impossible, I think, to reprove with more wisdom, tact and kindness the besetting sin of the *ouvrier*, which is to leave his wife alone whilst he drinks in the public house. On the other hand, the Bishop has the rare courage to reprove with some severity the tendency of a trifling exercise of the fancy which especially has so much invaded the Roman Catholic worship. Some ladies, aided by a ladies' priest, had made a wonderful *mois de Marie* in the cathedral during the prelate's absence. On his return he saw a mountain of flowers, ribbons, gilt papers, vases and other trifles which are the delight of French ladies who have nothing to do. One glance was enough. 'Let all that be removed at once,' he said; 'is this place a theatre?'

The writer tells how the same Bishop set himself to combat indifference and unbelief by lectures exclusively addressed to men, which drew together on an average 1,200 of the middle and upper classes. He dealt with rationalism in the tone of a man who knew what the world was and would not affect to be shocked by a fact so familiar as the existence of all manner of heresies. He never had recourse to denunciation, never rose into the region of mysticism, but spoke in a very clear, direct manner and always to the point. "I never heard more perfect elocution," says Mr. Hamerton; "indeed, I never heard any orator who so fully realized my notion of what public speaking ought to be. With the most beautiful ease of delivery, every sentence was constructed in such pure French that a literal report of the lecture might have been published, without correction, in a book. The speaker never once hesitated or went back to correct himself and every syllable was distinctly heard in every corner of the cathedral. This great oratorical charm was intensely appreciated by the strange congregation there assembled. All present listened willingly and went again and again. There were even, it is said, a few conversions."

These sidelights upon the religious situation, projected from an outsider's viewpoint, corroborate what we have been hearing, from time to time, about the religious revival which is steadily progressing all over the country. There is no other religious organization in France on a par with the Catholic Church. However affected by the skepticism of the epoch, the French laity, as a body, have no desire to get rid of the Church, which is still the Church of the majority, the Church of France, no matter who may be in power. Hugonotism is a memory. French Protestantism cannot compete with Catholicism. "Dissenters are so few in France," writes Mr. E. Boyd Smith,⁴ "that party spirit has not that un-Christian venom which pervades some countries." Protestantism in France has only the same kind of position as Unitarianism in England, to which it assimilates. The skepticism and indifferentism which are more or less on the surface are only passing phases of thought. When they shall have passed, the Church which has providentially regained its freedom of action, unhampered by State interference in episcopal nominations, will have a still freer hand. It may be questioned if, in all the course of ecclesiastical history, the Church had more liberty in the purely spiritual domain in most countries than it has at present. No foreign Power can now veto the election of any Cardinal to the Papacy; no Minister of Public Worship in France dictate who shall or shall not preside over this or that see. The clergy are no longer the paid servants of the State, but, like the clergy in

⁴ "My Village."

Ireland, where the Church, for its material needs, depends upon the voluntary contributions of the faithful. This, as time goes on, should bring the Church and the democracy closer to one another and break down the barriers of anti-clericalism—an anachronism since the failure of dynastic rival factions and the summons of Leo XIII. to French Catholics to rally round the Republic have created an entirely new situation in France.

R. F. O'CONNOR.

Dublin, Ireland.

SIXTEEN CENTURIES OF DOUBT.

PLACE Constantius, a bitter Arian, at the head of the Roman Empire, set up the anti-Pope Felix in the chair of Peter, drive Athanasius from his see, remember that Arianism is sweeping over the world like a soul pestilence, and the stage is set for the signing of an heretical profession of faith by the exiled Pontiff Liberius.

Yet as we watch and wonder, in from the land of doubt and obscurity there rolls a mist, thick, heavy, impenetrable, screening the action from our eyes; of a sudden it clears away, the shackles are struck from the Pontiff's wrists and he reënters Rome in triumph.

How did it come about? What was the price of this return? Was the faith of Liberius as pure as his honor had been untainted when he was dragged from his throne and driven into exile?

The case of Pope Liberius offers no difficulty to a Catholic theologian; no *ex cathedra* pronouncement was made, therefore there can be no question of Papal infallibility. The Pope is infallible only when speaking *ex cathedra*; whatever Liberius may have said or done during the whole Arian controversy was not said or done *ex cathedra*. Some indeed maintain with Bellarmine that even in private belief a Pope can never go astray; others with Suarez claim that he may, while Palmieri naively remarks that we should not be too eager to claim for the Pontiffs a prerogative they have never claimed for themselves.

It is well, then, to bear in mind at the very outset that Liberius, since he did not speak *ex cathedra*, could have signed an admittedly heretical profession of faith without in any way going counter to the dogma of infallibility. But did he? To this the historian must reply, and his first answer will be a distinction—Liberius was presented with three distinct creeds, all Arian, commonly called the Three Formulæ of Sirmium. One of these was certainly heretical, and Liberius as certainly condemned it; the other two were of dubious orthodoxy, capable withal of Catholic interpretation; of these the one was presented to the Pontiff six years before his exile; had he signed it he would never have been banished from Rome; the other was submitted to him in exile, and this is the formula he is commonly accused of having signed.

This paper deals exclusively with this last formula, and it is our purpose to show that Liberius did not sign this third formula of Sirmium and condemn Athanasius as the price of his return to Rome.

Sozomen has a thrilling account of the fall of Liberius. Constan-

tius is in Rome besieged by a mob clamoring for the return of the Pontiff; the Emperor promises to recall him provided he will condemn Athanasius and embrace Arianism; Constantius then leaves for Sirmium and orders Liberius to admit that the Son is not consubstantial with the Father; Liberius stoutly refuses. A new creed is drawn up, ambiguous at best, not clearly heretical. Bishops crowd around the Pontiff—Arian, semi-Arian, orthodox. All urge him to sign, begging him thus to bring about peace and end the schism. Liberius signs, and, prolonging the stroke of his pen, condemns all who do not admit that the Son is like the Father in substance and in all things. He is then allowed to return to Rome.

The story reads well, but is not founded on fact. Sozomen followed the account of Sabinus. Sabinus was an Arian, dealing with Arian fables, exploiting Arian tales.

Far stronger evidence against Liberius is furnished by three of his letters, written in exile and found in a fragmentary work of St. Hilary of Poitiers.

The first is addressed to the Arian Bishops. "I do not defend Athanasius," writes Liberius, "but because my predecessor had received him I also acted in the same way. But when I came to see the justice of your condemnation, I immediately agreed in this, your decision."

In the second letter the exile writes: "From a love of peace, which he preferred to martyrdom, he had already condemned Athanasius, who was rejected by the whole Roman Church, as the priests at Rome could testify."

In the third we read: "I have given up the contest for Athanasius. Forward my letter to the Emperor, that I may be freed from this misery."

These quotations are riddled with withering anathemas hurled at the prevaricator, the apostate Liberius—anathemas which must have shriveled up his spirit and left him soulless.

One will already have concluded that the letters cannot be genuine else the Liberian controversy had not vexed the world these sixteen centuries. They are forgeries; they were not edited by Hilary; neither did Hilary, in consequence, ever anathematize Liberius.

Obviously, in a brief study such as the present, conclusions rather than premises must needs be presented, yet the testimony of these letters seems so damaging that to disprove their authenticity becomes of interest.

The original letters are in barbarous Latin, full of grammatical blunders, rich in solecisms—such, in fact, as an educated man like Liberius, whose mother tongue was Latin, could never have written. They are identical in thought, style and tone with "Student

paci," a letter also attributed to Liberius, but admittedly spurious. They differ as widely from genuine letters of Liberius as does a tyro's first theme from the last line in *De Senectute*. More than this, they present the Roman clergy as rejecting Athanasius, whereas the Roman Church never condemned him; they are supposedly written by the Pontiff in exile, but why in exile, if, as they claim, he had done all that was required of him—signed the formula and condemned Athanasius? This was the hour for which the Arians longed. To effect this Constantius had broken every law, human and divine. Why hesitate to enjoy the triumph? The best critics have therefore concluded that these letters are forgeries, written by a Greekling, with little regard for grammar and less for truth, who then scattered them broadcast as part of a vast scheme to besmirch the honor of a man whose name was above reproach. The same critics go further and deny that St. Hilary edited the fragments and hurled the anathemas at Liberius. The fragment was written after the double council of Seleucia-Rimini, when Liberius for a third time had refused to yield to the Emperor's demand. Would Hilary in exile for the Nicene Creed anathematize Liberius in exile for that same creed? Yet St. Hilary seems to have condemned Liberius on other occasions, for in one of his genuine works we read that he (Hilary) "did not know which was the greater presumption on the part of the Emperor, the banishment of Liberius or his recall to Rome," intimating that the return of the Pontiff was most humiliating to one in his exalted position.

Only a mind persuaded of the guilt of Liberius can see any allusion to his fall in these words of St. Hilary. The Emperor is blamed for his presumption in having exiled the Pontiff, and blamed again for having brought him back under humiliating conditions. Hilary's only difficulty is to decide whether it were more brazen to drag a Pontiff from his throne and exile him or to bid him mount and share it with an anti-Pope.

Then there is Jerome, ever on the alert to crush the heretical egg. There is no doubting his meaning when he writes: "Liberius, wearied by exile, signed the heretical error and entered Rome in triumph." His meaning is not so clear when he says: "Fortunatian (Bishop of Aquileia) was infamous for having been the first to break the courage of Liberius and induce him to sign the heresy, and this on his way to exile." If Fortunatian broke the Pontiff's courage on the way to exile and induced him to sign then, how explain that the Pontiff remained two years in exile? The blunder is similar to the one made by the forger of the three Liberian letters. The Bollandists claim that the lines are interpolated; others admit their authenticity, but think that Jerome was deceived by Sozomen's

story and by the Arians. It seems more than likely that he saw the forged letters in the hands of Fortunatian, and then, ardent spirit that he was, without reflecting, without investigating, penned his injudicious censure.

Opposite to Jerome in every way stands Athanasius, that mighty man whom God raised up to guard the deposit of faith. For years he had withstood the wind and the sea, a powerful beacon-light, built in on the rock of Peter, warning the wanderers away from the reefs; lovers of darkness stormed at him and labored to overthrow him, but his light still flashed out its signals over the Arian darkness. Five times they dulled his light in exile, then they pounded at the base on which he rested; they hoped to shatter the rock of Peter and see lighthouse and foundation topple and fall into the swirling waters.

Liberius and Athanasius, bound together by love of truth and of the Nicene faith, had stood against the world. Arles condemned Athanasius, Liberius condemned Arles; Milan condemned Athanasius, Liberius condemned Milan. Athanasius was exiled, so was Liberius, and now from the quiet of exile Athanasius writes: "Liberius was banished; after two years he yielded and, from fear of death with which they threatened him, he signed." And again: "Even if he did not endure the miseries of exile to the end, still he remained two years in banishment." "Did not endure to the end" surely implies a breaking down, a yielding, a signing.

These are serious charges indeed coming from a man like Athanasius. May we doubt the authenticity of the extracts? They are found in a work written six years before the supposed fall of Liberius; whence the Bollandists conclude that they are interpolations inserted into the genuine work of Athanasius by enemies of Liberius—a practice not at all uncommon in those times. Others, on the contrary, and with good reason, maintain that though Athanasius first wrote the book before the fall of Liberius, he nevertheless recalled the manuscript after the fall, and then it was that he expressed his belief in the Pontiff's guilt.

Be this as it may, let us admit that the condemnation is genuine. When or where did Athanasius get his information? In exile, surrounded by Arians, cut off from communication with the orthodox. There he learns that Liberius has been exiled; later on he hears of his return. He who knows the Emperor's mind so well can think of only one solution—the Pontiff must have yielded. The Arians are quick to confirm the suspicion, hoping thus to shake his constancy. Forged letters of Liberius are at hand and shown; rumor has it that he has signed; he is in Rome; would Constantius have allowed him to return without signing? Would he himself be allowed

to return to Alexandria unless he signed? Therefore it was that Athanasius concluded Liberius had fallen.

A deeper study of the whole question would convince one of this explanation. If it seems weak, then to the testimony of Athanasius may be opposed a certainly genuine letter of Pope St. Anastasius, who ascended the Papal chair thirty-two years after the death of Liberius. It must be admitted that a Pope in Rome, living so close to the events under consideration, was in a better position to gather evidence and pass judgment than was Athanasius in exile. St. Anastasius writes: "It was by God's providence that all the efforts of Constantius to overthrow the Nicene faith failed; that Nicene faith for which those who were then proven to be holy Bishops gladly underwent exile—Dionysius, now a saint of God; Liberius, of holy memory, Bishop of Rome; Eusebius of Vercelli, Hilary of Poitiers and others who were all ready to be crucified rather than blaspheme the God Christ or say that the Son of God was a creature of the Most High."

This letter has only come to light within the last half century and must go far to lift the shadow that has long hung over the name of Liberius. One could not wish a stronger defense. "All efforts of Constantius failed," and surely his most persistent and determined effort was made against Liberius. "Those who were then proven to be holy Bishops, ready to be crucified rather than deny the consubstantiality of the Son," are mentioned by name, and prominent among them the name of Liberius—not of a vague, indefinite Liberius, but he of holy memory, Bishop of Rome. Surely Anastasius could not have spoken thus of Liberius in a public document had Liberius broken down in exile and signed an heretical formula.

Theodoretus tells the whole Liberian incident as dramatically as does Sozomen, but, and this is more to our purpose, with greater show of truth. Liberius is in exile, Constantius in Rome. Noble matrons beg their husbands to present a petition to the Emperor asking for the return of the Pontiff. The husbands hesitate between love of their lives and love of their wives. They know the Emperor's mind; he might condemn them to death for presenting their petition, yet if they do not present it, their wives will abandon Rome and live in exile with the Pontiff. Cleverly they play on womanly vanity. They persuade the insistent matrons to array themselves in all their finery and present their own petition to the Emperor. He could not refuse them, he would not kill them. Like other Esthers, then, they come before Assuerus. Assuerus demurs. Is not Felix Pope? Is not one enough? They insist. The Emperor yields and issues an edict ordering the illustrious exile to return and

share the throne with Felix. The Romans scorn the proclamation. The city rings with the cry, "One God, one Christ, one Bishop." "I have put down their very words," writes Theodoretus, and continues, "then that wonderful man Liberius returned."

The recorded speeches are probably as true as are similar ones in Tacitus or Livy; the point to be noted, however, is that the return of Liberius is not ascribed to the signing of any formula, but to the fact that the Emperor yielded to pressure brought to bear upon him by the matrons of Rome.

Socrates, another historian, assigns a more convincing motive—"Liberius was recalled from exile because the Romans revolted, drove Felix from the Church and forced the Emperor, though unwilling, to accede to their demands."

Still another historian, Sulpicius Severus, has a similar account, brief and clear. He writes: "Liberius, too, and Hilary of Poitiers were exiled, but Liberius returned on account of riots in Rome."

The testimony of Rufinus serves rather to show how early the fall of Liberius was debated than to vindicate the Pontiff's innocence. Yet it is favorable in this sense that it proves conclusively that even during the lifetime of Liberius there was no clear evidence of his guilt. It strengthens our belief, too, in the theory that there was a sinister move on foot to spread false rumors about the Pontiff's actions—rumors which gained credence even among the holy. Rufinus writes: "Liberius returned to Rome while Constantius was still alive. I can get no accurate information as to whether he was allowed to return because he yielded to the Emperor's wish and signed or because the Emperor yielded to the people's wish and allowed him to return."

In his youth Rufinus had known Liberius; he had studied under Fortunatian, who held the forged letters of Liberius, yet he could get no definite information; how, then, could Athanasius in exile or Hilary or Jerome in far-off Palestine?

Coming out of this maze of contradictory evidence into the clearer region of truth, study the man Liberius and see if he be such a one as would break down in exile and sign away his faith.

Study him as the Romans saw him immediately after his return. His entrance into the city was a magnificent triumph. The Romans, loyal supporters of Athanasius and staunch defenders of the Nicene Creed, would never have welcomed a man who had betrayed his friend and denied his faith; they would never have decreed a triumph to an apostate; neither would they have allowed a heretic to sit on the chair of Peter. They would not have lived in peace and closest union with him during the eight years that yet remained of his pontificate. They asked for no profession of faith, they de-

manded no recantation, they ordered no reparation of scandal, for there had been no scandal.

Furthermore, the conduct of Constantinus is psychologically impossible in the hypothesis that Liberius signed the formula. It should have been his triumph; it was the Pontiff's. He had labored like one possessed to shake the constancy of Liberius, yet he does not flaunt his victory before the world; nay, rather he renews his attack in another council. He boasted of other successes. He told of Osius of Cordova, who in an evil moment wavered in his faith, yet he never gloried in the fall of Liberius.

The whole pontificate of Liberius was a continued struggle with Arianism and Constantius. Scarcely seated on the Papal chair, he saw his legates and the whole council of Arles forced to a condemnation of Athanasius by the Emperor. Liberius alone stood out and wrote to express his sorrow at the action, hoping that he might die lest he be accused of having agreed to the act of injustice. Then came the council of Milan, where by similar tactics a like condemnation was secured. Again Liberius refused to sanction the action of the council. Constantius saw that to gain his point he must win over Liberius. He sent him his price. The Pontiff scorned the offer, demanded a free council and stipulated that the Arians be excluded. Exile was the answer. Later he returned. Two years passed. The council of Seleucia-Rimini was trapped into a condemnation of Athanasius, and for the third time the staunch Liberius condemned the findings of the council in spite of the Emperor's commands.

Now in all fairness such a man cannot be judged likely to have yielded in exile. The giant oak is not uprooted by the first great storm that blows. A man who twice defied the Emperor before exile and once after exile is not likely to have yielded during exile.

True, the blundering Sozomen, the forged letters, the hesitating Hilary, the ardent Jerome, the exiled Athanasius, all say that he did yield. On the other hand, Theodoretus, Sulpicius, Severus, Socrates and Pope St. Anastasius say that he did not yield. Add to this the failure of Constantius to avail himself of his supposed victory, the failure of the Arians to boast of their triumph, the acceptance of the Pontiff by the Roman clergy and his own consistent opposition to the Emperor before, during and after exile, and it must be admitted that Liberius signed no Arian formula as the price of his return to Rome.

ZACHEUS JOSEPH MAHER, S. J.

JAN VAN RUYSBROECK, L'ADMIRABLE, A GREAT FLEMISH MYSTIC AND FRIEND OF GOD.

Contemplation is a science without mode,
Above human reason remaining evermore:
Unto our reason can it not come down,
Neither above it can reason ever rise.

—"De vera contemplatione."—Ruysbroeck.

RUYSBROECK, the great Flemish mystic, was a Friend of God and a contemporary and friend of Suso and Tauler. He was born at Ruysbroeck, a small village on the Senne, between Brussels and Hal, in 1293, and as very little is known of his antecedents, the name of his birthplace is the only one by which history records him. It is not very strange that a veil of mystery should enshroud one who has been called "the greatest mystic the world has ever seen."

He received very little education, but was ordained priest in 1316, and became vicar of St. Gudule, in Brussels, where he remained until he was sixty. He then retired, by the advice of a hermit named Lambert, to Grunenthal or the Green Valley, in the forest of Soignes, and at first lived in a small wooden hut, but was soon joined by some companions who were kindred spirits and with them founded the monastery of Grunenthal, of which he became prior, and there they gave themselves up to the contemplative life. It was here that he composed in Flemish all his mystical works.¹

The fame of his sanctity soon spread and drew many visitors to Grunenthal from Holland and Germany to consult him. Sometimes these intruders were actuated by curiosity, and some stories are told of the way in which he dealt with this class of visitor. On one occasion some friends from Paris came ostensibly to consult him as to what stage in the spiritual life they had reached, but all they could get out of him was "that they were as holy as they wished to be." This sounded too oracular to satisfy their spiritual curiosity and failing to catch the inner meaning of his words, they were angry. At last, seeing this, he vouchsafed to explain himself and said: "My very dear children, I said that your holiness was that which you desired it to be; in other words, it is in proportion to your good will. Enter into yourselves, examine your good will, and you will have the measure of your state."

Ruysbroeck was once lost in the forest, and after looking for him in all directions, a light like that of a burning bush attracted one of his most intimate friends, and his religious brethren advanc-

¹ *L'Ornement des Noces Spirituelles, de Ruysbroeck l'Admirable. Traduit du Flamaud et accompagné d'une Introduction par Maurice Maeterlinck. Bruxelles, 1911; pp. 21-22.*

ing to it, found him in an ecstasy under a tree and the tree was in flames.

His biographer Surius, a Carthusian monk at Cologne, who lived nearly two centuries later, tells us that when Ruysbroeck died, the bells of a Dutch convent were tolled spontaneously without the help of ringers. He also says that his body was exhumed and found incorrupt five years after his death, and sick persons who were brought to it were cured by its wonderfully sweet perfume.

Another Carthusian, Denis, said of Ruysbroeck: "He had no teacher but the Holy Ghost. He was ignorant and illiterate. Peter and John were the same. His authority, I believe, to be that of a man to whom the Holy Ghost has revealed secrets."²

Maurice Maeterlinck, who has translated his greatest work, "*L'Ornement des Noces Spirituelles*," into French and added a masterly introduction to it, thinks him as a mystic beyond all praise, though as a writer he criticizes him severely and says, "I have toiled in the sweat of my brow over his involved syntax," and that "he was entirely ignorant of the skilled methods of philosophic thought."³

Perhaps it was inevitable that Maeterlinck, the master of exquisite prose himself, should be somewhat severe in his criticism of Ruysbroeck's faults as a writer, though he acknowledges that his abstruseness is partly due to the heights of mysticism and the depths of human thought to which he conducts his readers. Paradoxical as it sounds, "Ruysbroeck," says Maeterlinck, "could only think the unthinkable and speak the unspeakable."

Those who are unaccustomed to the writings of the great mystics would find him unreadable and to thoroughly understand him, something more than an intellectual acquaintance with mystical works is necessary, for he dealt with matters which are beyond ordinary knowledge and penetrated into realms where what is heard, seen and felt human language cannot describe. And it is not always the mystics who are to be blamed when they are not understood; it is sometimes the reader's fault, because he has not sufficient experimental knowledge of spiritual things to follow the mystic's leading, and Ruysbroeck leads to unexplored heights of contemplation, where the air is too rarified for ordinary mortals to breathe.

In speaking of Ruysbroeck's marvelous mystical knowledge, Maeterlinck says: "This monk possessed one of the wisest and most exact and most subtle philosophic brains which have ever existed. He knew no Greek and perhaps no Latin. He was alone and poor

² *Studies in Mysticism*, by Rufus Jones, p. 308.

³ Maeterlinck, p. 2.

and yet in the depths of this obscure forest of Brabant, his mind, ignorant and simple as it was, receives all unconsciously dazzling sunbeams from all the lonely mysterious peaks of human thought. He knew, though he was unaware of it, the Platonism of Greece, the Sufism of Persia, the Brahmanism of India and the Buddhism of Thibet and his marvelous ignorance rediscovers the wisdom of buried centuries and foresees the knowledge of centuries to come."⁴

The true Catholic solution of this enigmatic knowledge of Ruysbroeck's would seem to be, that like that of St. Theresa, St. Hildegarde and St. Bridget of Sweden and other canonized mystics, his knowledge was infused. He is known as the Ecstatic Doctor. He was the link between the Friends of God and the Brethren of the Common Life, who were sometimes called "the Founders of the New Devotion," the most celebrated of whom were Gerard Groote and Florentius. In the *Life of Gerard Groote* by St. Thomas a'Kempis, there is a beautiful description of a visit of Gerard to Ruysbroeck, who was then the venerable Prior of Gruenthal. Gerard went to visit him because he had only known him hitherto by repute and by his books, and he longed to see him face to face and to hear his words, "and his voice as gracious as if it were the very mouth-piece of the Holy Ghost."⁵ He took with him one Master John Cele, the director of the school at Zwolle, and a faithful and devout layman, one Gerard, a shoemaker.

We continue in the words of a'Kempis, so beautifully translated by J. P. Arthur, who has managed to preserve the charm of the original French version. "When they came to the place called Grunthal they saw no lofty or elaborate buildings therein, but rather all the signs of simplicity of life and poverty such as marked the first footsteps of our Heavenly King, when He, the Lord of Heaven, came upon this earth as a Virgin's Son in exceeding poverty.

"As they entered the gate of the monastery that holy father, the devout prior, met them, being a man of great age, of kindly serenity and one to be revered for his honorable character. He it was whom they had come to see, and saluting them with the greatest benignity as they advanced and being taught by a revelation from God, he called upon Gerard by his very name and knew him, though he had never seen him before. After this salutation he took them with him into the inner parts of the cloister as his most honored guests and with a cheerful countenance and a heart yet more joyful showed them all due courtesy and kindness, as if he were entertaining Jesus Christ Himself. Gerard abode there for a few days

⁴ Ruysbroeck and the Mystics. M. Maeterlinck; pp. 12-13.

⁵ Founders of the New Devotion, by Thomas a'Kempis. Translated by J. P. Arthur.

conferring with this man of God about the Holy Scriptures, and from him he heard many heavenly secrets which as, he confessed, were past his understanding, so that in amazement he said with the Queen of Sheba; 'O excellent Father, Thy wisdom and Thy knowledge exceedeth the fame which I heard in my own land: for by Thy virtues Thou hast surpassed Thy fame.'⁶

So impressed was Gerard by the conversation of Ruysbroeck that when he reached home he wrote down all he could remember. The death of Ruysbroeck was divinely revealed to Gerard, who announced it to the inhabitants by tolling the bells, and he privately told some of his friends that the soul of the Prior of Grunenthal had passed into Heaven after one hour of Purgatory.

One of the results of this visit to Grunenthal was that Gerard Groote decided on his return to build a monastery for canons regular at Windesheim. He was moved to do so by the love and reverence he felt for the Flemish king of mystics and his followers, who lived so holy a religious life at Grunenthal, for he said, "He had observed in them a mode of life greatly tending to edification by reason of their deep humility and the wearing of a simple garb." Gerard did not live to accomplish this himself, for he died three years after his visit to Ruysbroeck, but he left his plans to his disciples and they carried out his wishes and built the house at Windesheim for canons regular, of which Thomas a'Kempis afterwards became the chief ornament. Windesheim was a desolate place, between Zwolle and Deventer, and there Florentius built the first house of the celebrated canons of Windesheim. They took no formal vows, but followed the rule of the canons regular of St. Augustine. In a sense they may be said to owe their foundation to Ruysbroeck, for it was he who by his example inspired Groote and through him the other Brethren of the Common Life to build this house. Ruysbroeck was also visited at Grunenthal by the great Dominican mystic and Friend of God, John Tauler.

The list of his works is a long one, containing twelve volumes. They were written in Flemish, but were translated into Latin by Laurentius Surius, and recently his most celebrated book, "The Adornment of the Spiritual Marriage," has been translated into French by M. Maeterlinck, and in the latter part of the nineteenth century Ernest Hello, one of the greatest living French mystics, made a selection from the Latin version of Surius and translated extracts which appealed to him into French and published them.

According to M. Maeterlinck, who being himself Flemish and a great critic, is in a position to judge, Surius in his Latin version,

⁶ *The Founders of the New Devotion*, By Thomas a'Kempis. Opera Omnia. Volume II. Translated by J. P. Arthur, 1902.

which the great Flemish master of style describes as noble and subtle in its Latinity, has been scrupulous to give the exact meaning rather than a literal translation of the original, and has sometimes in his anxiety to be accurate paraphrased Ruysbroeck and used two or three words where he employed only one, so that his edition is somewhat diffuse.

M. Maeterlinck by giving us a French translation of "The Adornment of the Spiritual Marriage" from the original Flemish has conferred a great boon upon students of mysticism, and it is to be hoped that he will give us further translations of Ruysbroeck's writings. Even then for those who do not read French easily a second translation will be necessary, and in mystical works like Ruysbroeck's, where he endeavored to put into words thoughts that transcend every human language, it may easily happen that this double reflection of his meaning may occasionally be distorted before it reaches our understanding, and this is probably why "the most mystical of all the mystics" is found so difficult of comprehension even by those well versed in mysticism.

The titles of Ruysbroeck's books often vary according to the fancy of the scribe who copied them or the translator who translated them, and those of Surius generally differ from the Flemish titles, which, however, were not Ruysbroeck's, for he seldom gave his works any title. The following is a list of his works:

"The Book of the Twelve Béguines" is called by Surius "Of True Contemplation," a better and more suitable title.

"The Mirror of Eternal Salvation," sometimes called "the Book of the Sacraments," was sent by the author to a Poor Clare in the convent of that order in Brussels named Margaret van Meerbeke.

"The Book of the Spiritual Tabernacle" has in Surius a title three lines long, beginning "In the Tabernacle of Moses." This is Ruysbroeck's longest work.

"The Book of the Twelve Virtues" is simpler, and contains some beautiful thoughts on humility and detachment.

"The Book of the Sparkling Stone" is called by Surius "De Calculo, or Concerning the Perfection of the Sons of God," and is said by him to be an admirable little book.

"The Book of the Seven Steps of the Ladder of Love" is called by Surius the Seven Degrees of Love.

"The Book of the Seven Castles" resembles the Interior Castle of St. Theresa. Surius gives this book the title "Of Seven Watchmen."

To "The Book of Supreme Truth" he gives the name of "Samuel."

"The Book of the Kingdom of Lovers" was partly written in

verse and is said by M. Maeterlinck to be the most abstract of all Ruysbroeck's works. . .

"The Book of the Four Temptations" is a small one and deals with temptations which assail the contemplative life.

"The Book of Christian Faith" is another very short book.

"The Adornment of the Spiritual Marriage" is Ruysbroeck's best known work, of which we shall say more presently.⁷

The two leading notes of Ruysbroeck's life and teaching were Love and Joy—Love for Our Lord and Joy in holy things. His rule of life was to do all for love of our Lord and to perform all the actions of his daily life as for Him.

Speaking of the mystic Joy which he so often experienced, he says: "I must rejoice without ceasing, although the world shudder at my joy." But before quoting passages from his writings to illustrate these characteristics, we propose to give a short analysis of his book, "The Ladder of Love." The leading idea of it is that by seven steps of ever growing Love we mount up to that consummation "in which we are burned up like live coals on the hearth of His infinite charity."

The seven steps are Good-will, Voluntary Poverty, Purity, Lowliness of Mind, Desire for God's glory, Divine Contemplation and the Unnamable transcendence of all thought and knowledge. On this Ladder there are three stages: 1, The Active Life; 2, The Inner Life, and, 3, The Contemplative Life. These are again divided into three ways according to the three ways in which the words "Ecce sponsus venit" may be interpreted. First, the Advent of Our Lord in the days of His flesh; 2, His coming by grace; 3, His coming to Judgment.

The Inner Life is also subdivided into three stages. The first of these stages is the illumination of the intellect by His coming. The second stage is the effort of the will in going out to meet Him, and the third the desire to be united brings about the actual meeting. The third stage is attained by only the few, and in trying to describe it, Ruysbroeck follows Dionysius, the pseudo-Areopagite, and Eckhart.

The three leading principles of the book are, first of all, zeal for the service of God in the active life. Secondly, the Son in us responding to the Father's call—in Ruysbroeck's own words "the abyss of God calleth to the abyss in us." And, thirdly, the retention of individual personality in union with God. Ruysbroeck has no pantheistic tendencies; he always insists that no matter how close and intimate the union between God and the human soul may be, the soul always retains its individuality. Neither does he savor

⁷ Maeterlinck, pp. 23, et seq.

of quietism; he is careful to emphasize the need for active service as well as for passive contemplation, and compares the contemplative life to breathing, where the expiration is the going out to active work for God, and the inspiration the return of man into himself until he comes into union with God.⁸ He never ceases in all his books to speak of the joys of introversion.

The Book of the "Adornment of Spiritual Marriage" might almost be said to be a treatise on Joy, for there is a joyous smile on almost every page of it; there is joy even in suffering. The hermit of Grunenthal knew by experience that suffering and spiritual joy go together. Joy is but the obverse side of suffering, and as a modern pagan writer has said, "self-reununciation is joy."⁹ Ruysbroeck in this beautiful book of his says: "Out of all sufferings and all renunciations the man will draw for himself an inward joy; he will resign himself into the hands of God and will rejoice to suffer in promoting God's glory. And if he persevere in this course, he will enjoy secret pleasures never tasted before: for nothing so rejoices the lover of God as to feel that he belongs to his Beloved."

It is not only suffering and joy that he associates together, but Love and joy also, but then love is often suffering. In the Book of the Seven Castles he speaks of the sufferings of love, which make man now hot, now cold, and brings him both hope and despair, but when the soul attains to union with God, he thus defines his love and his joy.

"This love is a wave boundless and calmed, of riches and joys, in which all the saints are swallowed up with God in an unlimited enjoyment. And this joy is wild and lonely like a wondering, for it has neither limit, nor road, nor path, nor rest, nor measure, nor end, nor beginning, nor anything which one can show or express by words."¹⁰

This man was a poet as well as a saint, like most mystics, whether they can express their thoughts in verse or not; the frenzy of the poet has something akin to the ecstasy of the mystic.

In "the Ladder of Love," his most beautiful work, he cries out in a rhapsody which, if the paradox may be forgiven, though prose rises higher than poetry, for surely it was inspired.

"The Holy Ghost cries in us with a loud voice and without words, 'Love the love which loves you unceasingly.' His crying is an inward contact with our spirit. This voice is more terrifying than the storm. The flashes which it darts forth open the sky

⁸ Maeterlinck, pp. 67-70.

⁹ Matthew Arnold.

¹⁰ Maeterlinck, p. 71.

to us and show us the light of eternal truth." * * * * "For the more we love, the more we desire to love, and the more we pay of that which love demands, the greater becomes our debt to love. Love is not silent, but cries continually, 'Love thou love.' To love and to enjoy, this is to labor and to suffer. Our work is to love God; our enjoyment is to receive the embrace of love."¹¹

He was a true artist, though his medium was neither the brush nor the chisel, and like all artistic natures, he loved color, especially green, though he was probably ignorant of the physical effects modern science has discovered green has on the recuperative forces and its restful qualities. He attributed mystical meanings to colors and speaks of the golden color of love, the white color of innocence, the purple that is violet or blood red color of generosity, the red color of burning love. He associates yellow with obedience, because he was a poet and saw that yellow was the color of the sunflower, which obediently turns to the sun as he rises, all of which he brings out beautifully in his "Book of the Spiritual Tabernacle."

He lived in an age when mystical qualities and symbolical meanings were attributed to precious stones, and doubtless the work on Precious Stones by Bishop Marbod, from which other mystical writers have drawn, had reached him. As green was his favorite color, so was the emerald his favorite gem, and after the emerald, the jasper, which, he says, is also green, though we should have said it was a reddish yellow.

As he thinks the emerald the most beautiful precious stone he compares it to Our Lord in "the Spiritual Tabernacle," where he says: "In this article we compare to the Son of God that beautiful stone which is called the emerald and which is so green that no leaves nor grass nor any other green thing can compare with its viridity. And it fills and feeds with its greenness the eyes of those who behold it. Now when the eternal Word of the Father was made Man, then was seen the greenest color ever known on earth. That union of natures is so green and so lovely and so joyful that no other color can equal it, and so in a holy vision it has filled and fed the eyes of such men as have prepared themselves to perceive it. And in another article we compare Christ to the jasper, which has a green color very pleasant to the eye, and it almost equals the emerald in its greenness. And so we compare it to the ascension of Our Lord, Who was green and beautiful in the eyes of the Apostles and so pleasant that they could never forget Him during all their lives."¹²

¹¹ Maeterlinck, p. 68.

¹² L'Ornement des Noces, pp. 47-49.

Both Virgil and Pliny mention jasper as a green stone. In the *Eneid* Virgil speaks of a sword studded with jasper. Probably he and Ruysbroeck meant the stone we call aqua-marine, a kind of beryl which is a greenish color, though compared with the green of the emerald, the true beryl, it is as water unto wine.

In the *Book of the Sparkling Stone*, which Surius describes as an admirable work, Ruysbroeck says some very strange and beautiful things about what he says he calls the contemplative life, but even in this description of the very highest form of contemplation he does not separate it from the active life, for he had no patience with people who spend their time waiting for visions and was wont to say that love cannot be idle. After saying that "God sends us out to keep His commandments as His faithful servants, and He calls us in as His mysterious friends to obey His counsels," he continues thus:

"And in the repose of our spirit we receive the incomprehensible splendor which envelops and penetrates us, just as the air is penetrated by the brightness of the sun. And this splendor is merely a boundless vision and a boundless beholding. What we are that we behold and what we behold that we are; for our thought, our life and our essence are closely united with that truth which is God and are raised along with it. And that is why in this pure vision we are one life and one spirit with God, and that is what I call a contemplative life."¹³

Ruysbroeck was the prototype of the modern mystic, *Conventry Patmore*, for the theme of the poet in "*The Angel of the House*" and of the Flemish mystic in "*The Adornment of Spiritual Marriage*" was *Spiritual Espousals with the Divine Bridegroom*. *M. Maeterlinck* says that the first twenty chapters of this work of Ruysbroeck, which he has translated into French, contain little more than mere mild pious commonplaces, and that it is full of repetitions and apparent contradictions, and he fears that only those accustomed to the works of the Neo-Platonist will penetrate far into it. But the fact is that no Neo-Platonism, no mere study of mystical works will enable the reader to penetrate into the transcendental mysteries here clothed in language inadequate to express them; no effort of the imagination nor of the reason will avail us; nothing but experimental knowledge of the ways of God with the soul which only the very few possess is of use. Ruysbroeck himself uttered a great and pertinent truth in those words of his above quoted: "What we are that we behold and what we behold that we are." He beheld more than it is often given to man to behold, because he was worthy to behold it, and he tried to translate

¹³ *Ibid.*, 62-63.

his visions into human speech. Words often fail to express the deepest thoughts of ordinary men and women; how much more feeble are they to express the unutterable spiritual truths revealed to this holy man. As M. Maeterlinck happily says, "This book is not too far from us; it is we who are too far from the book. There are passages of incomparable beauty in it which can be understood by all, and throughout its pages these two leading figures of Love and Joy go hand in hand."

Here is a lovely passage on the Soul's hunger for God:

"Here there begins an eternal hunger which shall never more be satisfied. It is the yearning and the inward aspiration of our faculty of love and of created spirit towards an uncreated good. And as the spirit desires joy and is invited and constrained by God to partake of it, it is always longing to realize joy. Behold then the beginning of an eternal aspiration and of eternal efforts, while our impotence is likewise eternal. For a created vessel cannot contain an uncreated good, and hence that continual struggle of the hungry soul and its feebleness which is swallowed up in God."

Much spiritual consolation and comfort may be gleaned from this book, for the writer knew the human heart with all its longings, its doubts, its fears, its misery and its sufferings as well as he knew the only Source from which that comfort and consolation can be derived. For instance to timid souls who fear they love not God he says: "There are, nevertheless, some righteous men who believe that they neither love nor rest in God. But this thought itself springs from love, and because their desire to love is greater than their ability, therefore it seems to them that they are powerless to love."

To suffering souls who have learnt resignation he has much to say. "Out of all sufferings and all renunciations the man will draw for himself an inward joy; he will resign himself into the hands of God and will rejoice to suffer in promoting God's glory. And if he perseveres in this course, he will enjoy secret pleasures never tasted before; for nothing so rejoices the lover of God as to feel that he belongs to his Beloved." A little further on he describes how consolation and desolation are all one to the truly resigned, and illustrates it by a beautiful poetical simile.

"At this season the sun enters into the sign of Libra, for the day and night are equal and the day and night equally balanced. Even so for the resigned soul, Jesus Christ is in the sign of Libra, and whether He grants sweetness or bitterness, darkness or light, of whatever nature His gift may be, the man retains his balance, and all things are one to him with the exception of sin, which has been driven out once for all."

It would be easy to multiply these extracts, but it is time now to examine Ruysbroeck's best known work, "The Adornment of the Spiritual Marriage," translated a few years ago into French by Maurice Maeterlinck, for which work all lovers of mysticism owe him a debt of gratitude. The treatise is divided into three books, of which the second is by far the longest, containing 172 pages, while the first book consists of only 73, and the third of only 14 pages. There is a short prologue to both the first and second books, and they are all divided into very short chapters, some only half a page in length. This arrangement greatly simplifies a book which has little method or plan in it, for construction was not the strong point of the great Flemish mystic, but to those accustomed to mystical writings the book will not we think be so incomprehensible as M. Maeterlinck appears to have found it. Parts of it are undoubtedly obscure, where the author treats of highly interior experience which cannot be translated into human speech; on the other hand, much is exceedingly simple, particularly the first book, which treats of the active life and the virtues.

The text upon which the whole treatise is founded is "Ecce Sponsus venit, exite obviam ei." In the first book he treats of the way in which the Bridegroom comes—first, in the flesh at the Incarnation; secondly, to every loving soul daily and frequently in graces and gifts according as man can receive them, and, thirdly, at the Last Judgment. Then he speaks of the spiritual going out of the soul towards the virtues as one way of going out to meet the Bridegroom, and in the following chapter he deals with the virtues themselves, such as humility, generosity, diligence, purity, patience, sweetness, meekness and compassion. Here Ruysbroeck is true to the principles of the Friends of God in teaching that good works are essential to the higher contemplative life and comprehended in it.

In chapter 25 he speaks of the spiritual meeting between God and the soul which takes place in three ways. First, we must love God in everything wherein we shall merit eternal life; secondly, we must attach ourselves to nothing which we could love as much as or more than God, and, thirdly, we must rest in God with all our zeal above all creatures and above all the gifts of God and above all the works of the virtues and above all the sensible grace that God can bestow upon the body and the soul.

The last chapter in the first book is beautiful and describes how we desire to know the Bridegroom in His nature when we have gone forth in all the virtues to meet Him. It is not sufficient then to a man to know Christ in His works; then he will do as Zaccheus did, who desired to see Jesus; he will go before all the

crowd—that is to say, all the multitude of creatures, for they make us so small and so short that we cannot perceive God, and he will mount upon the tree of Faith, which grows from the top downwards to the bottom, for all its roots are in the Divinity. The lower branches of this tree speak of the humanity of God; the upper part of the tree speaks of the divinity of the Trinity of Persons and of the unity of the Divine nature. The man will rest himself on the Unity at the top of the tree, for it is there that Jesus will pass with all His gifts. “Here He arrives and sees the man and tells him in the light of faith that He is according to His Divinity, immeasurable and incomprehensible, inaccessible and abyssal and that He surpasses all limited comprehension. It is the supreme knowledge acquired in the active life to recognize this in the light of faith that God is inconceivable and unknowable.”¹⁴

In this light Christ says to the desire of the man, “Come down, for to-day I will dwell in thy house.” This rapid descent to which God invites him is nothing else than a descent by desire and by love into the abyss of the Divinity that no intelligence can attain in created light. But there where the intelligence remains outside, love and desire enter.” Ruysbroeck concludes this chapter by saying: “If you have met Christ by faith and the intention of love, you dwell in God and God dwells in you and you possess the active life, which is the first kind of life of which He desired to speak.”

In the prologue to the second book he strikes the note on which all the chapter more or less resounds, namely, the word “Ecce,” for here he treats of vision. “In the middle of the night, that is to say, when we least expect it, a spiritual cry sounds in the soul: ‘Behold the Bridegroom cometh.’ We are going to speak of this vision of the interior arrival of Christ, and of the spiritual going out of man to meet Jesus, and we are going to elucidate and explain these four conditions of an interior life, elevated and desiring what all cannot attain to, but where nevertheless many do arrive, thanks to the virtues and to interior courage.”¹⁵

He then goes on to explain briefly what the four conditions are, and the whole of this second book is devoted to the development of this theme; but as M. Maeterlinck says, Ruysbroeck follows no definite plan, for even when he has made one, he digresses from his point constantly to penetrate into regions where it is sometimes very difficult to follow, since when he reaches these heights, words often fail to express his meaning.

The first of these four conditions is: Our Lord in this word

¹⁴ L'Ornement, etc., p. 149.

¹⁵ L'Ornement, p. 152.

'Ecce' wishes that our intelligence should be illuminated with a supernatural light. In the second place in the words "Sponsus venit" He tells us what He wishes us to behold, namely, the interior arrival of our Bridegroom. In the third place, He orders us to go out, and in the fourth place, He teaches us that the end of all these works is the meeting of Jesus Christ in the unity of the Divinity.

One of Ruysbroeck's methods of teaching is by divisions and subdivisions of subjects, and in the first chapter of the second book, which is very short, he tells us of three things necessary to him who would behold in a supernatural sense—first, the light of Divine grace; secondly, the abandonment of all interior images and, thirdly, the turning of the will to God with all our strength.

A few chapters later on he speaks of three methods in which Our Lord comes to the interior man and their effects, each of which raises man to a higher state and to a more intimate kind of prayer. We may sum up these chapters briefly in the words of St. Edmund in his "Mirror," where he says, "Prayer or Orison is nothing else but love-longing,"¹⁶ for it is by love that the soul goes out to meet the Bridegroom. In them he treats of the soul's love for God and of the obstacles that it meets with and of how it must behave under these circumstances.

In chapter 28 he speaks of the fourth advent of the Bridegroom, which corresponds with the Dark Night of the Soul of St. John of the Cross, where the soul is deprived of all comfort and feels itself deserted and often suffers great exterior trials at the same time.

In chapter 35 he speaks of yet another kind of advent which he compares to a fountain from which flow three rivers, and which is the fulness of Divine grace in the unity of our spirit.

In the chapters following chapter 40 he teaches the four ways in which a man who is confirmed in grace should go out to meet the Heavenly Bridegroom. First, he must direct himself to God and all the saints; secondly, he must come down from these heights and go forth among sinners and labor among them; thirdly, he must go out spiritually to the souls in Purgatory and pray for them, and, lastly, he must pray for himself and for all men of good will.

After this come some beautiful chapters upon how Christ was and is and ever will be the Lover of our souls and in what manner He abandons Himself to us in the Blessed Sacrament; and another

¹⁶ The Mirror of St. Edmund, p. 40. Burns & Oates, London. He also says "Contemplation is nothing else but the sight of the goodness of God." Ibid., p. 13.

chapter treats of the Unity of the nature of Almighty God in the Blessed Trinity and of the eternal hunger for God which the soul experiences and which can never be fully satisfied. We shall here quote a paragraph on this subject which shows how lucid Ruysbroeck can be sometimes even when treating of very high matters:

"Here begins an eternal hunger which can never be fully satisfied. It is an interior avidity and aspiration of amative force and of the created spirit towards an uncreated good. And as the soul desires the enjoyment of the love of God and is invited to it and forced to it by God, it wishes always to realize it. Behold here begins an eternal aspiration of eternal efforts in an eternal want of power. These are the poorest men that can be, for they are insatiable gourmands and they have a craving hunger. Although they eat and drink, they are never satisfied in this world, for this hunger is eternal. For a created vase cannot contain an uncreated good, and this is why there are these eternal hungerings after God, Who inundates them all with a want of power."¹⁷

In the latter chapters of this second book the Ecstatic Doctor considers the fourth and last point of his text, namely, the actual meeting of Christ, our Bridegroom, and the soul, for this he says is the end of all our internal spiritual vision both in grace and in glory, for He is our eternal rest and the end and reward of all our labors.

This coming of our Lord and our meeting with Him takes place in two ways, namely, with and without an intermediary, and Ruysbroeck proceeds first to describe this meeting without an intermediary, and here he soars to sublime heights of philosophical contemplation only to be followed if the whole chapters dealing with it are quoted, which is here impossible. When he comes to describe the meeting with an intermediary he is much clearer; the first meeting is the essential meeting of God and the human soul; the second is the active meeting and the intermediaries are the graces and interior gifts which God showers upon the soul and which He is ever renewing, and these intermediaries are indispensable to all men and to all souls for without the intermediaries of divine grace and of free and loving conversion of the soul to God no creature can be saved. The concluding chapters of the second book deal with the gifts of the Holy Spirit and with three kinds of very interior exercises.

The last book, which contains only six chapters, teaches how we are to arrive at a contemplative life, which he describes as a singular adornment and a celestial crown and the eternal reward of all the virtues. He insists, as all the mystics insist, that no one can arrive

¹⁷ *L'Ornement des Noces Spirituelles*, p. 258.

at this life of contemplation by human knowledge or subtility, but only by the Will of God, and very few attain to it. He then describes the divine meeting which takes place in the most secret part of the soul and he is certainly quite as comprehensible as either Eckhart or Tauler or any other mystic who has attempted to put into words such unutterable truths.

Such is a brief summary of a book which it is exceedingly difficult to analyze, and the process is something like dissecting a flower to discover to what order it belongs, whereby all the form, the fragrance, the beauty and the delicate coloring are destroyed. To do anything like justice to its author, the book requires to be read as a whole, and then it will not yield up all its beauty at a first reading, for, as we have seen, it treats of very high spiritual matters. Perhaps enough has here been said to induce those who are unacquainted with any of the works of the Ecstatic Doctor to study for themselves this volume which M. Maeterlinck has so ably translated into French from the Flemish.

DARLEY DALE.

CATHOLIC USES OF THE ADESTE FIDELES

TO THOSE who have been familiar from childhood with the most "Christmassy" of hymns the title of this paper might well appear foolish. Which of us will not take it for granted that a Catholic hymnal must include both the text and the tune of this old favorite? Whatever judgment an editor may pass on the popularity and appropriateness of any other hymn, and therefore on its availability for inclusion in his volume, we might well suppose that he would consider the inclusion of this one as *de rigueur*.

The title, however, is not quite so foolish as might at first sight appear. In my study of the hymn I have come upon some variations of use that are interesting, some that are fairly striking and some that suggest practical considerations for hymnal editors.

THE LATIN TEXT.

So far as we now know¹ the earliest form of the Latin text comprised four stanzas, beginning with the words *Adeste fideles, Deum de Deo, Cantet nunc Io*, and *Ergo qui natus*, respectively. This is the form found in various manuscripts written by John Francis Wade, the earliest one of which is authentically dated 1750. The name of this diligent scribe is apparently English, although he signs it in the Latin form, *Joannes Franciscus Wade*. The present locales of the manuscripts are in Scotland (Euing Library, Glasgow, "1750"), England (Stonyhurst College, "1751;" St. Edmund's, Ware, "1760;" Henry Watson Library, Manchester, undated), and Ireland (Clongowes Wood College, Sallins, County Kildare, undated).²

The earliest known appearance of the French form of the hymn (which comprises stanzas beginning respectively with the words: *Adeste fideles, En grege relicto, Stella duce Magi, Aeterni parentis, Pro nobis egenum*) is in an Office of St. Omer (St. Omer's, 1822.) More than threescore and ten years—the full Scriptural lifetime of man—intervene between the Euing Library manuscript and the

¹ Cf., "The Text of the Adestes Fideles" in the REVIEW for October, 1914.

² I include the Clongowes Wood College manuscript, although its present locale is unknown. Dr. W. H. Grattan Flood referred to it in his article on the hymn in "The Dolphin," Vol. VIII, 1905, p. 709, and Dom Gregory Ould, O. S. B., refers to it in his "Book of Hymns With Tunes" (London, 1913), as the source of his words. A letter which I addressed to the college in 1914 asking for certain details, however, resulted in the information that the manuscript cannot now be found, and that the same reply had to be given to Dr. Flood, who had also asked about it in 1914.

first known appearance of the French form of the hymn. We may fairly conclude that the English form is the original.³

Now let us follow the story of the English form of the Latin text. It appears in the manuscripts cited; also in an "Evening Office" of 1760 published in London; also in Coghlan's "Essay on the Church Plain Chant" (London, 1782) and in the reissue of that volume in 1799; and meanwhile in Webbe's "Collection of Motetts or Antiphons" (London, 1792). In Ireland it appeared, says Dr. Flood, in P. Wogan's book of 1805.

In view of all this it is curious to note that in the United States of America it should have waited so long for publication. The library of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia has two rare volumes of Catholic music published in Philadelphia in 1787 and 1791.⁴

Neither volume contains the "Adeste Fideles." This seems the more remarkable in view of the evident scarcity of Catholic hymns at hand in Philadelphia in the closing years of the eighteenth century.

It was my impression for many years that the hymn could be found, both in Latin and in English, in every hymnal meant for the use of English-speaking Catholics. To my surprise, however, I find neither Latin nor English in the following volumes:

1. A Compilation of Litanies, Hymns. (Philadelphia, 1787.)
2. A Compilation (revised edition of above). (Philadelphia, 1791.)
3. A Collection of Hymns (revised edition of above). (Philadelphia, 1814).
4. The Pious Guide to Prayer. (Georgetown, "Potowmack," M.DCC.XCII.)
5. True Piety, or the Day Well Spent. (Baltimore, 1809.)
6. L'Ange Conducteur. (New York, 1856.)
7. Catholic Youth's Hymnal. (New York, 1891.)
8. Cantate (English and Latin hymns). (New York, 1912.)
9. Cantemus Domino (English and Latin hymns). (St. Louis, 1912.)

The omission of the "Adeste Fideles" from these books appears to me surprising, in view of the popularity of the hymn from the middle of the eighteenth century in England down to the present day. That it should not appear in Nos. 1 and 2 might be explained by the disturbance caused by the War of the Revolution. It should, however, appear in No. 3, as it had been published in Philadelphia, apparently before the year 1800, by John Aitken. The "Stabat Mater" is given in No. 4. No. 5 has the corresponding Easter hymn, the "O Filii et Filiae." No. 6 has many liturgical Latin hymns. But the omission is still more surprising when we find Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, and 9 giving the Easter hymn ("O Filii"),

³ All this is told more fully in the article in the REVIEW for October, 1914.

⁴ "A Compilation of Litanies and Vespers, Hymns and Anthems as they are sung in the Catholic Church. Adapted to the voice and organ. By John Aitken." The volume contained 136 pages, small quarto. It was issued again, much revised, in 1791, by the same publisher.

although it is no more liturgical than the "Adeste" and is, I am convinced, much less popular.

I have also found a large number of hymnals that give only the Latin text. Sometimes this text is that which I have styled, for the sake of convenient reference, the "English Cento," and sometimes, but less frequently, that which I have styled the "French Cento."⁵

(a) Latin text (only) of the French Cento.

The Roman Hymnal. (New York, 1884; 21st edition, c., 1906.)
Vade Mecum (for Four Male Voices). (New York, 1905.)
Katholisches Gesangbuch. (Philadelphia, 1907.)
Caecilia. (New York, 33d edition, 1909.)
Parish Hymnal. (St. Louis, 1915.)

(b) Latin text of the English Cento.

Cantica Sacra. (Boston, 1865.)
Sodalist's Vade Mecum. (Philadelphia, 1882.)
Laudis Corona. (New York, 1885.)
Crown of Jesus Music. (London, s. d.)
Catholic Hymns (ed. Tozer). (London, 1898.)
Catholic Church Hymnal (ed. Tozer). (New York, 1905.)
Oratory Hymn Book. (Birmingham, Eng., 1906.)
Hymns for the Ecclesiastical Year. (New York, 1908.)
The Book of Hymns. (Edinburgh, 1910.)
The Book of Hymns With Tunes. (London, 1913.)
Crown Hymnal. (Boston, 1912.)
Catholic Choir Hymnal. (New York, 1914.)
Holy Name Hymnal. (Reading, Pa., 1914.)

It may seem strange that the Oratory Hymn Book should not include Father Caswall's beautiful translation, as it is found in several Protestant hymnals.⁶

Let me add here a list of hymnals in which I find only an English translation of the hymn:

Manual of the Sodality B. V. M. (New York, 1897.)
Psallite (ed. Roesler, S. J.). (St. Louis, 1901.)
Holy Family Hymn Book. (Boston, 1904.)
Sursum Corda (ed. Bonvin, S. J.). (St. Louis, 1911.)
Hosanna (ed. Bonvin, S. J.). (St. Louis, 1912.)

The translation in the "Sursum Corda" and the "Hosanna" is from the Latin of the French Cento.

TRANSLATIONS USED IN OUR HYMNALS.

I have noted⁷ the appearance in "The Evening Office of the Church in Latin and English" of what apparently was the first translation of the Latin text into English, and the subsequent versified translation ("Come, faithful all, rejoice and sing") in

⁵ Cf., "The Text of the Adeste Fideles" in the REVIEW for October, 1914.

⁶ In "Hymnal Companion to the Prayer Book." (Boston, 1885, p. 23) it is set to the traditional tune, but in "The Hymnal . . . as used in Trinity Church, New York" (New York, 1893, No. 50), it is set to a tune ("Roxburghe"), by Henry Smart, which agrees rather better with its rhythm than does the traditional tune.

⁷ Cf., "Protestant Uses of the Adeste Fideles" in the REVIEW for April, 1915, pp. 257-258).

"Every Families' Assistant at Compline, Benediction," etc., issued in 1789. I do not know of any repetition elsewhere of either of these versions. I also called attention to an excellent version which first appeared, it would seem, in America ("Hither ye faithful, haste with songs of triumph"), which deserves a separate heading:

I. "HITHER YE FAITHFUL, HASTE WITH SONGS OF TRIUMPH."

I do not know the source of this version. Julian's "Dictionary of Hymnology"⁸ ascribes it to a Presbyterian hymnal published in Philadelphia in 1843. One may fairly assume that, as Julian knew of no earlier appearance, the translation is of American origin. I found this version in a Catholic choir-book published by Benjamin Carr in Baltimore in 1805, and as this date preceded by thirty-eight years its appearance in the Presbyterian hymnal, I declared my opinion that it was probably of Catholic origin. Subsequently, however, a reference to it in Hobart's "Festivals and Fasts" (1804) to the effect that it had been frequently sung in Episcopalian services on Christmas Day led me to a change of view. Once more, however, the question is put in the melting-pot by the fact that a Philadelphia publisher issued it in large music-sheet form apparently before the year 1800. This publisher was John Aitken, who had issued two editions (1787, 1791) of a large choir-book for Catholic use, although himself, doubtless, not a Catholic, as he also published the King James version of the Bible. The version of the hymn may have been a Catholic one.⁹

⁸ Second edition, London, 1907.

⁹ The point is one of so much interest to American Catholics that I may be permitted to set down here some bibliographical details. In Willis P. Hazard's revised and enlarged edition (Philadelphia, 1884) of Watson's "Annals of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania in the Olden Time" we read (Vol. III, p. 151): "Blake and Willig were among the earliest music publishers in Philadelphia. Mr. Blake died nearly one hundred years of age, at No. 13 South Fifth street. Mr. Blake stated that Messrs. Carr and Shetkey were publishing music previous to 1800, and that John Aitken was their predecessor for several years at No. 3 or 5 South Third street." The large quarto page (issued by John Aitken) of the "Adeste Fideles" is headed: "The celebrated Portuguese Hymn for Christmas Day." It also bears the statement: "Philadelphia: Published by John Aitken, and sold at his Musical Repository, North Second street, No. 76, and to be had at Charles Taws, Walnut street, No. 60." As this "celebrated Portuguese Hymn" is not included in Aitken's Catholic choir book of 1787 or 1791, we may fairly suppose that its celebrity was not known to him at those dates, and we may conjecturally date his publication of the hymn as later than 1791. Having examined the early Philadelphia Directories, Mr. James Warrington writes me concerning John Aitken: "He appears to have been a Silversmith and Copper Plate printer, and apparently conducted his business with other persons. I searched the Directories from 1791 to 1806. Charles Taws, whose name is on the sheet of 'Adeste Fideles' with

If so, it is to be regretted that it did not continue in use in our hymnals and that it was replaced by a much inferior translation, to which we may next direct our attention.

2. "WITH HEARTS TRULY GRATEFUL."

This translation appeared in a Catholic hymnal published at Washington in 1830.¹⁰ It is unkempt from a poetical standpoint, but its rhythm was fairly adapted to the musical accents of the traditional tune, and perhaps this is the reason for the great favor shown to it by American editors of Catholic hymnals. It is not too obtrusively offensive to a poetical ear when it is sung; but when it is printed apart from the music (for example, in the small books used by a congregation merely for the words) its mimicry of rhyme is most unpleasant:

With hearts truly grateful,
Come all ye faithful,
To Jesus, to Jesus in Bethlehem.
See Christ, your Saviour,
Heaven's greatest favor.
Let's hasten to adore Him, our Lord and King.

God to God equal,
Light of Light eternal,
Carried in Virgin's ever spotless womb;
He all preceded,
Begot, not created.
Let's hasten to adore Him, our Lord and King.

Angels now praise Him,
Loud their voices raising;
The heavenly mansions with joy now ring;
Praise, honor, glory,
To Him who's most holy.
Let's hasten to adore Him, our Lord and King.

To Jesus, born this day,
Grateful homage repay;
'Tis He who all heav'nly gifts doth bring;
Word increated,
To our flesh united.
Let's hasten to adore Him, our Lord and King.

We, joyfully singing,
Grateful tributes bringing,
Praise Him and bless Him in heavenly hymns.
Angels implore Him,
Seraphs fall before Him.
Let's hasten to adore Him, our Lord and King.

The third and fourth stanzas give rhymic closes to the symmetrically placed third and sixth lines. The other stanzas have no

that of Aitken, appears at 60 Walnut street, up to and including 1800, but in 1801 the name becomes John Taws. Aitken's name appears at various places, but I do not find No. 76 North Second until 1801, when at that address the name of V. Blanc, Coppersmith, appears. I think we are safe, therefore, in assuming that the sheet was published not later than 1800."

¹⁰ Cf., "Protestant Uses of the 'Adeste Fideles'" in the REVIEW for April, 1915, p. 259, where fuller details are given.

rhyme in these places. The fourth stanza rhymes the first two lines; the fifth rhymes the first two of the first half and also of the second half of the stanzas. It therefore seems clear that the translator aimed to produce a rhymed version. But, unfortunately, we find such mimicries of rhyme as *grateful* and *faithful*, *Saviour* and *favor*, *equal* and *eternal*, *preceded* and *created*, *praise him* and *raising*, *glory* and *holy*, *increated* and *united*. Again, the first two lines of the fourth stanza cannot be made to fit in with the tune unless by improperly giving the musical accent to the word *this* and to the syllable *re* of *repay*.

I do not know of any English editor who has used it for a hymnal. It appeared, however, in the "Catholic Choralist" (Dublin, 1842), and Dr. W. H. Grattan Flood declares¹¹ without qualification or hesitation that the translator was Father William Young. The date (1840) he assigns is nevertheless ten years later than its appearance (1830) in the hymnal published at Washington, D. C. How long it may have retained a vogue in Ireland I do not know. The hymnal¹² compiled by the Rev. C. Gaynor, C. M., uses a different version.

In his "Dictionary of Hymnology"¹³ Julian lists it among the translations not in common use. This may be true of the British Isles, but it is very wide of the mark if we consider American Catholic hymnals and prayer-books. I have found it, for instance, in the following:

1. A Collection of Psalms, Hymns. (Washington, 1830.)
2. The Morning and Evening Service. (New York, 1840.)
3. Catholic Choralist. (Dublin, 1842.)
4. Key of Paradise (prayer book). (Baltimore, 1842.)
5. Manual of Catholic Melodies. (Baltimore, 1843.)
6. Catholic Sunday School Hymn Book. (Philadelphia, 4th ed., 1850.)
7. Manual of Catholic Piety (prayer book). (New York, 1850.)
8. Sacred Wreath. (Philadelphia, 1863.)
9. Key of Paradise (prayer book). (New York, 1874.)
10. Catholic Youth's Hymn Book. (New York, 1885.)
11. Sursum Corda. (New York, 1888.)
12. Spiritual Treasure. (Doylestown, Pa., 1888.)
13. Holy Face Hymnal. (New York, 1891.)
14. Manual of the Sodality B. V. M. (New York, 1897.)
15. Psallite. (St. Louis, 1901.)
16. Catholic Boy Choir Manual. (New York, 1901.)
17. Holy Family Hymn Book. (Boston, 1904.)
18. St. Basil's Hymnal. (Toronto, 10th ed., 1906.)
19. Parish Kyrial and Hymnal. (Rochester, N. Y., 1912.)
20. Prayer Book for Religious. ed. Lasance. (New York.)
21. American Catholic Hymnal. (New York, 1913.)
22. English and Latin Hymns. (New York, 1914.)

In an edition of the "Manual of Catholic Piety," edited by Father Gahan, O. S. A., in Dublin, in 1839, I find only the Latin text

¹¹ Cf., "Notes on the Origin of the Melody of the 'Adeste Fideles'" in "The Dolphin" for December, 1905, p. 711.

¹² St. Patrick's Hymn Book, Dublin, 1906.

¹³ London, second edition, 1907.

(English cento) of the "*Adeste Fideles*." Possibly it had not appeared by that date in the "1830" translation in Ireland. Dr. Flood suggests the year 1840 as that of Father Young's "translation;" and it may be that Father Young espoused the cause of this "1830" translation in some fashion, and thus gave occasion to Dr. Flood's view that he was the translator. The American edition of the "*Manual*" in 1850 takes the trouble to include the "1830" version.

Before dismissing the subject of this long-lived and unquestionably popular version, I perhaps should say that in the "1830" volume the English cento of the Latin text (p. 74) has four stanzas, but the Washington hymnal renders it in five stanzas (p. 75), and then follows with the French cento (p. 76, the stanzas beginning with "*Adeste*," "*En grege*," "*Aeterni*," "*Pro nobis*"), and follows on (p. 77) with a translation of these "French" stanzas in a different metre: "*To Bethlehem haste on this auspicious day*," etc.

The "*Psallite*" of 1901 and the "*Parish Kyrial*" of 1912 change the first two lines into: "*Come, all ye faithful, Come with hearts all joyful*," and thus eliminate the objectionable appearance of rhyme ("*grateful*" and "*faithful*."). But in order to eliminate all such objectionable features, the whole poem should be similarly altered. Better still, it should be replaced by another translation.¹⁴

Looking at our list of books including the 1830 version, we perceive that every decade of years from that day down to the present is represented and that the vogue seems to increase as we compare the dates. For the four representatives of the forties and the two of the fifties, we have the twentieth century already giving us eight volumes that include it. And meanwhile we have had the translations of Oakeley, Caswall, Donahoe and the "*Missal for the Laity*" (London, 1903), as also that of the *Arundel Hymns*, and any one of these is very much better than the apparently deathless one of 1830.

3. FREDERICK OAKELEY'S TRANSLATION.

It is convenient to give as a title here the name of the author rather than the first line of his version; for the hymn has suffered

¹⁴ As illustrative of the popularity of the "*Adeste Fideles*," it is worthy of note that the Rev. J. M. Petter, S. T. B., gives only twenty-three English hymns and five Latin hymnal texts in his "*Parish Kyrial and Hymnal*" and that our hymn is found both in Latin and in English separately (pages 80 and 54 respectively). Similarly, the "*Andachten und Gesaenge . . .*" (Philadelphia, 1905), which has six Latin hymns, nevertheless includes two stanzas of the Latin text of "*Adeste*."

so many changes at the hands of hymnal editors that its first line would be no longer a clear direction to the reader.¹⁵

Julian declares that the original text is to be found in "The People's Hymnal" of 1867, and forthwith adds that it is also to be found in the "Wellington College Hymn Book" of 1863. The translation, however, had been written by Oakeley in 1841 for use by his (Anglican) congregation of Margaret Street Chapel, in London. As Oakeley became a Catholic four years later, it seems probable that his translation would appear in a Catholic hymnal or prayer-book of earlier date than the years of publication of the Protestant hymnals mentioned by Julian. I find it, for instance, in the "Vade Mecum," a Catholic prayer-book published at Baltimore in 1866; and this volume is merely an enlarged edition of a volume published in London for Catholic use, which had already attained great popularity¹⁶ and may be supposed, therefore, to have appeared several years previous to 1866.

Now the version in the "Vade Mecum" is different in some places from that which is given in "The People's Hymnal" of 1867 and described by Julian as "the original text."¹⁷ However, I shall take Julian's authority and print the form as given in "The People's Hymnal" of 1867, and, in order to illustrate the changes which the translation has undergone, compare it with the form given in our "Catholic Westminster Hymnal" of 1912:

¹⁵ Frederick Oakeley was born in 1802 at Shrewsbury, England, the youngest son of Sir Charles Oakeley, Bart.; was graduated at Oxford in 1824 and elected Fellow of Balliol in 1827; was made incumbent of Margaret Chapel, Margaret street, London, in 1839, and entered the Catholic Church in 1845. In 1841 he had translated the "Adeste Fideles" for use in his own chapel, but never published his version. It came into use, says Julian, by being sung in his chapel: "The original text was included in the 'People's Hymnal' (1867, No. 24), the 'Wellington College Handbook' (1863), etc., and has also been repeated in several Roman Catholic collections of recent date." Mgr. Bernard Ward mentions twelve of his works in the Catholic Encyclopedia, s. v. Oakeley, but does not refer to his authorship of a translation which is the most popular of all, both in Anglican and in Catholic use. He died in 1880.

¹⁶ The Preface to the American edition says: "The 'Vade Mecum' has great popularity with the Catholics of Great Britain, and may be safely recommended to American Catholics as one of the best in the English language."

¹⁷ I merely call attention here to a question of precedence which I am not able to settle by any final historical evidence. Julian says that the version was never published by Oakeley, but came into notice through its use in Margaret Street Chapel, and he apparently is unable to refer to any earlier hymnal than that of Wellington College of 1863—twenty-one years later in date than the written (and doubtless printed on leaflets) version. Has the manuscript of Oakeley or any one of its duplications (in manuscript or leaflet form) survived? If not, who shall say that the "Vade Mecum" version is not the original form?

THE PEOPLE'S HYMNAL, 1867. WESTMINSTER HYMNAL, 1912.

1.
Ye faithful, approach ye,
Joyfully triumphing,
O come ye, O come ye to Bethlehem;
Come and behold Him
Born the King of Angels:
O come, let us adore Him,
Christ the Lord.

2.
God of God,
Light of Light,
Lo, He abhors not the Virgin's
womb;
Very God,
Begotten, not created:
O come, let us, etc.

3.
Sing, choirs of Angels,
Sing in exultation,
Sing, all ye citizens of Heaven
above,
Glory to God
In the highest:
O come, let us, etc.

4.
Yea, Lord, we greet Thee,
Born this happy morning:
Jesu, to Thee be glory given,
Word of the Father
Late in flesh appearing:
O come, let us, etc.

1.
Come, all ye faithful,
Joyful and triumphant,
O hasten, O hasten to Bethlehem;
See in a manger
The Monarch of angels.
O come and let us worship
Christ the Lord.

2.
God of God eternal,
Light from light proceeding,
He deigns in the Virgin's womb
to lie;
Very God of very God,
Begotten, not created.
O come and let us, etc.

3.
Sing alleluia,
All ye choirs of angels;
Sing, all ye citizens of heaven
above,
Glory to God
In the highest.
O come and let us, etc.

4.
Yea, Lord, we greet Thee,
Born this happy morning;
To Thee, O Jesus, be glory given;
True Word of the Father
In our flesh appearing.
O come and let us, etc.

The form given in the "Vade Mecum" differs from that of the 1867 volume only in the following: In the first stanza, "behold ye" for "behold Him"; in the second, "disdains" for "abhors"; in the third, "quires angelic" for "choirs of angels," and "lo sing exulting" for "Sing in exultation"; in the fourth, "In our flesh appearing" for "Late in flesh appearing." The refrain throughout is "O come, let us worship" for "O come, let us adore Him."

What is the original source of the form given in our "Westminster Hymnal" I do not know. Julian refers to several variant forms of Oakeley's translation in Protestant hymnals.¹⁸ In our Catholic hymnals there are many variants. As the "Westminster Hymnal" is "the only collection authorized" for the Catholic dioceses of England and Wales, so is the (Baltimore) "Manual of Prayers" "the official prayer-book of the Catholic Church" in the United States. It will be of interest to see how this prayer-book

¹⁸ The form commencing: "O come, all ye faithful, joyfully triumphant," is, he says, "the most popular arrangement of the 'Adeste Fideles' we possess. It first appeared in Murray's 'Hymnal' (1852), and has passed from thence into a great number of collections, both in Great Britain and other English-speaking countries, the second line sometimes reading 'Joyful and triumphant,' and again 'Rejoicing, triumphant.' The 'Parish Handbook' (1863-75) adopts this latter reading, and in addition it includes other alterations of importance." Oakeley was rewritten also for Chope's "Hymnal" (1854).

treats Oakeley's text. With the exception of "behold ye" for "behold Him," the first stanza is unchanged, and the last stanza is also unchanged save in the third line ("O Jesus, now to Thee be glory given") and the fifth ("In our flesh appearing"). For easy comparison, therefore, it is necessary to print here only the second and third stanzas:

MANUAL OF PRAYERS.

2.

God of God eternal,
Light from light proceeding;
Lo, He deigns in the Virgin's
womb to lie,
Very God, yea,
Not made, but begotten:
O come, let us adore Him,
Christ the Lord.

3.

All ye choirs of angels,
Come, allueia! sing,
Sing all ye citizens of heaven
above,
Glory to God
In the highest heavens:
O come, let us adore Him,
Christ the Lord.

Now the "Westminster Hymnal" credits its form to Oakeley, without a hint anywhere that the form given is not that of Oakeley as originally written. The "Oregon Catholic Hymnal" (Portland and New York, 1912) uses a much-changed form and simply credits it to Oakeley. Catholic and Protestant hymnals are careless in this respect.¹⁹ The "Manual of Prayers"²⁰ does not mention the authors or translators of the sixty Latin hymns it includes, and cannot therefore be criticized for changing the text (as it does) without mentioning the fact. The advisability of the changes may well be challenged, nevertheless, from the standpoint of singableness. Let the reader try to sing line 3 in the second stanza, or line 2 in the third stanza, and he will experience not a little difficulty in properly adjusting the accents of the words to the melodic accents. The original Oakeley is much easier to sing. Why, then, were the changes—wherever they may have originated—made?

¹⁹ Some Protestant hymnals are more careful. Thus "Hymns Ancient and Modern" indicates that the form it uses is to be credited not simply to "Oakeley," but to "Rev. F. Oakeley and Compilers;" the "English Hymnal," which gives almost the exact form of the 1867 volume, nevertheless takes the trouble to indicate that a very few changes have been made (see page 49), and, later on, giving a translation of seven stanzas (four of the English Cento and three of the French Cento), places at the head of the compilation the legend: "Tr. F. Oakeley, W. T. Brooke and others." On the other hand, "The (Episcopalian) Hymnal . . . with music as used in Triinty Church, New York," changes Oakeley somewhat, but simply credits the form to him. This is true of many other Protestant hymnals. It is interesting to find the latest edition (1911) of "The (Presbyterian) Hymnal" giving the 1867 form without any change whatsoever and faithfully attributing it to "Rev. Frederick Oakeley, 1841." I need not add further illustrations, but it would have proved helpful if the "Westminster Hymnal" had indicated that its form is not the original of Oakeley.

²⁰ The "Parochial Hymn Book" (Boston, 1898) gives exactly the form of the "Manual of Prayers."

In the foregoing illustrations of variant forms, as also in the following additional illustrations, I must confess ignorance of the origin of the changes, and therefore I do not mean to attribute them to the editors of the Catholic hymnals in which I have found the variants in their multiplicity of forms. The exhibit with which we are confronted is nevertheless curious and interesting. One wonders throughout at the apparently anarchical spirit of the editors—whoever they may be—that originated the changes. And, meanwhile, we wonder that Oakeley's original was not simply retained, as, for instance, "The (Presbyterian) Hymnal," in its latest edition (Philadelphia, 1911) finds it convenient to do. As I do not know the sources of the changes I am about to note, I have not seen any reason for chronological order in the citation of the following Catholic hymnals.

I find at hand, then, "Fifty-one Miscellaneous English Hymns" (New York, 1901), in which I observe "The Westminster Hymnal" form with these variants: The third line of the third stanza is: "O sing all ye citizens" etc., and the fifth line is: "In the highest heaven."

I turn to "St. Patrick's Hymn Book" (Dublin, 1906) and find a different arrangement. In the first line of the first stanza an "O" is prefixed ("O come, all ye faithful") to the line as found in the "Westminster Hymnal;" the second line is the same in both; the remainder of the stanza is that of Oakeley's original text. In the last stanza the first two lines are those of Oakeley; the third is: "Jesu, be glory ever given to Thee;" the fourth line is that of Oakeley; the fifth is: "Now in flesh appearing." The second and third stanzas are so much varied that it may be well to quote them as they stand:

ST. PATRICK'S HYMN BOOK.

2.

True God of true God,
Light of light eternal,
Lo! He disdains' not the Vir-
gin's womb;
God uncreated,
Ere all time begotten,
O come, let us adore Him,
Christ the Lord.

3.

Sing, all ye angels,
Joyous alleluias,
Sing thro' the high court of
Heav'n above:
Now to our God be
Glory in the highest.
O come, let us adore Him,
Christ the Lord.

I turn next to "A Treasury of Catholic Song," edited by the Rev. S. S. Hurlbut (New York, 1915). In the first stanza we have the first two lines of "The Westminster Hymnal;" the third line (ex-

²¹ As Oakeley was a Protestant when he made his English version of the "Adeste Fideles," he chose, happily enough, the word "abhors" from the English version of the "Te Deum:" "When thou tookest upon Thee to deliver man Thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb." Oakeley translates the Latin of the 'Adeste': "Gestant puellae viscera" not literally (namely,

cept the initial "O") and the rest of the stanza is Oakeley. The second stanza is that of Oakeley, except that in the third line "disdains" replaces the "abhors" of Oakeley.²¹ The third and fourth stanzas are those of Oakeley, except that in the last stanza "Jesus" replaces "Jesu" in the third line, and "Now" replaces "Late" in the fifth line.²²

I turn to "St. Mark's Hymnal" (New York, 1910) and find Oakeley's original text throughout, except the first two lines of the first stanza: "O come, all ye faithful, joyful and triumphant," instead of "Ye faithful, approach ye, joyfully triumphing;" and the fifth line of the last stanza: "Now in flesh appearing" instead of "Late in flesh appearing." This hymnal has thus very slight changes, which can easily be recognized as improvements. Substantially we find in it Oakeley's original text, and the effect is good. This is the form which I find almost exclusively used in American Protestant hymnals.

In "Peters' Sodality Hymn Book" (New York, 1872) I find the "Westminster Hymnal" text, with slight variations: "True God of true God" instead of "Very God of very God" (fourth line of the second stanza); "In the highest, glory" instead of "In the highest" (fifth line of the third stanza); "Word of the Father, now in flesh appearing," instead of "True Word of the Father, in our flesh appearing" (fourth and fifth lines of the fourth stanza).

In the "Catholic Youth's Hymn Book," edited by the Christian Brothers (New York, 1885) I find the revision of "The Westminster Hymnal," except that in the third stanza "O" is prefixed ("O sing, all ye citizens," etc.), and "heaven" is added to the fifth line ("In the highest heaven").²³

"the womb of a Virgin bears"), as he endeavored to render literally the whole poem, but in the exact phraseology of the English "Te Deum:" "Lo, he abhors not the Virgin's womb." The word "abhors" may sound, at the present time, rather strong to pious ears. It has, nevertheless, a splendid energy in it and a suggestion of the infinite abasement of the Incarnation, and the Marquess of Bute retains "abhor" in the translation of the "Te Deum" in his "The Roman Breviary . . . translated out of Latin into English" (Edinburgh, 1879), as does also the editor of our official prayer book, the (Baltimore) "Manual of Prayers" (1896). The Catholic hymnal entitled "Arundel Hymns" (London, 1905) also retains the word: "Lo! He doth not abhor the Virgin's womb."

²² It may be stated here that Father Hurlbut gives the eight stanzas of the Latin text and supplies an unrhymed version of the four stanzas belonging to the "French cento," in order to have all eight English stanzas in the unrhymed and unrhymed form of Oakeley.

²³ Just here we meet a curious fact. The melody in Peters' volume is not the traditional tune, but a new one by Henry Leslie. This new tune is taken by the "Catholic Youth's Hymn Book," but the accompanying text is somewhat changed. Finally, in the "De La Salle Hymnal," a revision (New York, 1913) by the Christian Brothers of the 1885 hymn

Turning next to the "Sursum Corda," edited by the Rev. Ludwig Bonvin, S. J., (St. Louis, Mo., 1911), I find three of the four stanzas of the "French cento" translated in the unrhymed and unrhymthd form of Oakeley, preceded by the following variation of Oakeley's first stanza:

O come, all ye faithful,
Joyful and triumphant;
O come ye, O come ye all to Bethlehem;
Come and behold Him:
Born is our dear Saviour.
O come, let us adore Him, our Lord and King.

This is but a slight variation on the translation given by the "Arundel Hymns" (London, 1905) of the French cento. The two are identical in the first stanza, except that the form of the "Arundel Hymns" has "Born the King of Angels" instead of "Born is our dear Saviour" for the fifth line. The second stanza of both is identical throughout except, similarly, in one line: "Bounding with gladness" ("Arundel Hymns") for "With exultation" ("Sursum Corda"). The fourth stanza is identical in both, except that we find "For man poor and needy" ("Sursum Corda") instead of "For us poor and needy" ("Arundel Hymns"). The third stanza is rather more varied:

ARUNDEL HYMNS.

The Splendor Immortal,
Son of Sire eternal,
Concealed in mortal flesh our
eyes shall see
God is an Infant,
Swaddling clothes enfold Him;
O come, let us adore, etc.

SURSUM CORDA.

The Splendor Immortal,
Son of God eternal,
Concealed in mortal flesh our
eyes shall view.
See there the Infant,
Swaddling clothes enfold Him;
O come, let us adore, etc.

It is not easy to perceive, in general, the necessity for even the slight changes observable in the four stanzas I have here compared. May we indulge a hope that at some future day we shall have an "official" hymnal in America, whose texts will be either those of their authors or revisions made after much careful deliberation by a competent committee? At present every editor appears to consider it a solemn duty to change his texts in word or phrase.

It is interesting to observe that the "Arundel Hymns" keeps the English Cento of the Latin text separate from the French Cento and gives to the former its traditional tune, while the French Cento of the Latin is set to a tune by R. L. de Pearsall. The version of the

book, the tune is retained, but we find a new revision, with great alteration, of the 1885 text. The last stanza will serve to indicate that the version is based on Oakeley, and will also illustrate how far afield the revision goes:

Dear Lord, we greet Thee, born this happy morning;
To Thee, O Jesus, be glory given;
Salvation comes from Thee, Thou heaven-sent Redeemer.
Oh, come and let us worship Christ the Lord.

Latin text of the "English Cento" is substantially that of Oakeley. The changes are, I think, peculiar and the stanzas are therefore given here in full text (lines 1 and 2, 3 and 4 being printed as single lines):

Second Stanza.

True God of true God! Light of Light eternal!
Lo! He doth not abhor the Virgin's womb:
God uncreated, very God begotten:
O come, let us adore Him, Christ the Lord.

Third Stanza.

Sing, choirs of angels, sing in exultation,
Sing, all ye citizens of Heav'n above,
Glory to God, and in the highest glory!
O come, let us adore Him, Christ the Lord.

Fourth Stanza.

Therefore we greet Thee born this happy morning,
Jesus! to Thee all glory be outpour'd:
Word of the Father now in Flesh appearing,
O come, let us adore Him, Christ the Lord.

I fear to have taxed too heavily the patience of my readers in the minute details of the variations I have thus far given in Oakeley's text. But I wished to illustrate fully a curious fact, namely, that all of our Catholic hymnals using Oakeley's text differ, so far as I am aware, from one another in the form they give. It is strange that no two should agree in giving an identical text. This lack of agreement has its unpleasant features, quite apart from the question of propriety involved in altering an original text without permission of the author and without indication to the reader. Anarchical changes of the kind I have called attention to make the task of congregational singing more difficult than it needs to be. Especially is this true in the case of an unrhymed and unrhythmed translation, such as is Oakeley's version of the "Adeste Fideles." A glance at the first two lines of the second stanza of Oakeley's translation shows us the unrhythmical character of the lines. The words must be so spaced as to cover the music assigned to two full lines, like those of the first stanza. Gradually eye and ear are taught to coöperate, however, and then the memory is enabled to retain the arbitrary assignment of words to musical phrases. Any change in the words will, of course, disturb this memorized arrangement, and each new variation will call for particularized and minute attention. A new lesson will have to be learned; but it is rendered more difficult by the fact that an old lesson has meanwhile to be unlearned. Also, the spacing of word to tune must be, in an unrhythmical translation, an arbitrary matter. Once a traditional spacing has been achieved, it is unwise to invade the tradition by a series of words of unlike numerical syllabication, even though the new words should be better fitted to the tune. The invasion tends

towards anarchy; for each singer will have to space his words to the tune according to his best lights—and the lights differ for each singer, or all will have to be trained by one instructor. How can we hope to achieve such a thing congregationally?

In America, our separated brethren appear to have agreed on a unique form of the tune, while of nine hymnals²⁴ of ours appearing in the past five years I have not found any two adopting exactly the same form of the traditional tune. Similarly, the editors of the Protestant hymnals seem to have chosen the same form of the version of Oakeley.²⁵

4. FATHER CASWALL'S TRANSLATION.

Although it is an excellent piece of translation and versification, the editors of our Catholic hymnals seem not to have relished it for hymnal use. After his conversion to Catholicity in 1847 Caswall became (early in 1850) an Oratorian. His translation is not included, however, in the "Oratory Hymn Book" (Birmingham, 1906).

1.

Oh, come! all ye faithful!
Triumphantly sing!
Come, see in the manger
The Angels' dread King!
To Bethlehem hasten!
With joyful accord;
Oh, hasten! oh, hasten!
To worship the Lord.

2.

True Son of the Father!
He comes from the skies;
The womb of the Virgin
He doth not despise.
To Bethlehem hasten!
With joyful accord;
Oh, hasten! oh, hasten!
To worship the Lord.

3.

Not made but begotten,
The Lord of all might,
True God of true God,
True Light of true Light!

4.

Hark! to the Angels!
All singing in heaven,
"To God in the highest
High glory be given."

5.

To Thee then, O Jesus!
This day of Thy birth,
Be glory and honor
Through heaven and earth.
True Godhead Incarnate!
Omnipotent Word!
Oh, hasten, etc.

²⁴ I have mentioned them in the REVIEW for January, 1915, p. 123.

²⁵ E. g., "The Sunday School Hymnal and Service Book" (Medford, Mass., 1885, No. 212), "The Hymnal of the Church" (New York, 1889, No. 49), "Hymns of the Faith" (Boston, 1887, No. 55), "In Excelsis" (New York, 1900, No. 70), "Hymns and Tunes for the Children of the Church" (Philadelphia, 1886, No. 56), "The (Episcopalian) Hymnal" (Oxford, 1889, No. 49), "Hymns of Worship and Service" (New York, 1908, No. 52). The version used in these hymnals changes Oakeley but slightly: Only the first two lines of the first stanza are changed to "O come, all ye faithful, Joyful and triumphant," and the word "late" in the last stanza is changed to "now." "The Chapel Hymnal" (Philadelphia, 1898) and "The (Presbyterian) Hymnal" (Philadelphia, 1895) change only the first two lines of Oakeley (as above), so that these two differ from all the others mentioned only by having "late" (Oakeley's word) instead of "now" in the last line of the last stanza. These (and the last edition of "The (Presbyterian) Hymnal," which gives Oakeley without change) are all that I have consulted of those that use Oakeley. How wonderfully they agree!

The rendering is faulty from the hymnodal standpoint; for while the refrain (which I have quoted entire for the first two stanzas) is unchanged in the fifth stanza, the stanzaic form suggests that it is changed. The full metre implies a kind of breathless haste also, which the singer may unwisely, but very naturally, make his own rule of action.

I know of several Protestant hymnals²⁶ which employ this version, but I am not aware of any Catholic book that does so, although a fairly wide knowledge of its beauty must have been diffused by its appearance in various editions of Caswall's "*Lyra Catholica*" (London, 1849; New York, 1851; revised edition, London, 1884) and in his "*Hymns and Poems*," 1873. The form as given above is that in the revised edition (London, 1884) of the "*Lyra Catholica*." The form in the 1849 edition omitted stanza 3, and had "All" instead of "High" in the fourth line of the fourth stanza. Schaff pays it the notable tribute of inclusion in his "*Christ in Song*" (New York, 1869, p. 49), alone of the various translations of the hymn. He simply says: "Another translation in the *Hymnal Noted*."²⁷

Catholics have not taken Caswall's version to their bosoms. They prefer the multifarious and multiform printings of the translation of Oakeley, although this was written while Oakeley was still a Protestant minister and did not aim at either rhyme or rhythm. Oakeley seems to have considered the "*Adeste Fideles*" an ancient hymn of the Church and therefore deserving of a close literal translation. Perhaps, too, he desired to imitate in English the unrhythmical lines of the Latin and their lack even of medieval rhyme or assonance. Oakeley's translation, frankly disregarding rhyme and even rhythm, is immeasurably superior to the 1830 translation, which aims at both rhyme and rhythm, and succeeds in attaining neither.

I think that the 1830 translation is now used only in American (including Canadian) hymnals and that Caswall's translation is not used in Catholic hymnals anywhere, although it is used in Protestant ones. Oakeley's version, altered in innumerable ways, is used today very largely in both Catholic and Protestant hymnals. It is

²⁶ E.g., "*The Hymnal*" (Oxford, 1889, No. 50), "*The Church Hymnary and Psalter*" (New York, 1894, No. 179), "*Hymnal Companion to the Prayer Book*" (Boston, 1885, No. 20), etc.

²⁷ Is it possible that he was not aware of Oakeley's version? Schaff's form of Caswall includes some slight changes (e. g., the opening line is: "Come hither, ye faithful"). Perhaps it was from Schaff's volume that the version passed into "*The (Protestant Episcopal) Hymnal*," 1872. Julian notes that the original form of Caswall's translation "is in several collections and sometimes slightly altered, as in the '*New Mitre*,' 1874, and others."

unquestionably the prime favorite amongst all the many translations into English of the eighteenth century Christmas hymns.

UNRHYMED TRANSLATIONS.

We have considered the unrhymed and unrhythmed rendering of Oakeley. In the "Arundel Hymns" it has been altered so as to give exactly rhythmized stanzas (cf. above, stanzas 2, 3, 4).

The Rev. S. S. Hurlbut gives the eight stanzas of the Latin text (No. 17) in his "A Treasury of Catholic Song" (New York, 1915) and also (No. 18) an English rendering of the eight stanzas. The version of the four stanzas of the "English Cento" is that of Oakeley (with slight changes) and that of the four stanzas of the "French Cento" is, like Oakeley's, unrhymed. Two stanzas will serve to illustrate:

3.

See how the shepherds, summoned to His cradle,
Leaving their flocks, draw nigh with holy fear:
We too will thither bend our joyful footsteps.
O come, let us adore Him, Christ the Lord.

4.

Lo, star-led chieftains, Magi, Christ adoring,
Offer Him incense, gold and myrrh:
We to the Christ Child bring our heart's oblations.
O come, let us adore Him, Christ the Lord.

The "Missal for the Use of the Laity" (London, 1903) gives a new version of the "English Cento." No attempt is made to attain symmetrical rhythm within a stanza, but the homologous lines of the stanzas have the same number of syllables. Two stanzas will illustrate sufficiently the method employed (I combine the divided lines into four):

1.

12. O come all ye faithful, raise the hymn of glory,
9. Come view your Saviour in Bethlehem:
11. Born there, behold Him King of men and angels,
11. O come, let us adore Him, our Lord and God.

2.

12. The womb of the Virgin bears Him, true God of God,
9. And light of true light, a child on earth.
11. He is our true God, not made but begotten.
11. O come, let us adore Him, our Lord and God.

In stanzas 3 and 4 the first line counts only eleven syllables, and the last two stanzas are therefore more rhythmical than the first two.

In his "Early Christian Hymns, Series II," (Middletown, Conn., 1911, p. 197) Judge Donahoe similarly chooses stanzas without rhyme. I shall quote the first two for illustration (combining two lines in one):

1.

Appear, O ye faithful, raise your hymns in triumph,
And hasten, O hasten to Bethlehem.

Born is the Christ Child, monarch of the angels;
Bow down in adoration of God our King.

2.

Lord everlasting, Light of Light supernal,
Born of the Virgin Immaculate;
True God eternal, begotten, not created;
Bow down in adoration of God our King.

SOME RHYMED TRANSLATIONS.

In two old copies of the "Key of Heaven" (one wanting the title-page, but of date of 1840; the other dated Glasgow, 1846, I find a translation not listed by Julian:

Ye faithful souls rejoice and sing:
To Bethlehem your trophies bring,
Before the new-born Angels' King:
Come let us adore Him, etc.

True God of God, true Light of Light,
Born in womb of Virgin bright:
Begot, not made; true God of might.
Come let us adore Him, etc.

Angelic choirs with joy now sing,
The heavenly courts with echoes ring:
Glory on high to God our King:
Come let us adore Him, etc.

Jesus, whose life this day begun,
The Father's co-eternal Son;
Glory to Him be ever sung:
Come let us Him adore, etc.

The refrain, "Come let us Him adore," etc., is not printed in full, and one can only surmise what the concluding phrase should be. But the fact that this is taken for granted seems to imply that it was well-known, and that this version was sung in the churches.

In "The Catholic Manual," published by F. Lucas, Jr., at Baltimore in 1825, I find another version—this, however, being a translation of the "French Cento," the Latin text of which is also given—not listed by Julian. It requires some dexterity to fit the refrain into the traditional tune:

To Bethlehem haste, on this auspicious day;
Begone despair, our joy and hope are near:
The King of Angels earthward bend His way.

Chorus.

A God, a God! by love and justice sent!
In heaven, on earth, in hell let every knee be bent.

Hark, softly stealing on the midnight air,
Celestial voices catch the shepherds' ear!
Their flocks forgot—the crib is all their care.

Splendor eternal of th' eternal King,
By mortal shape obscured! a God in rags!
To Thee our thanks, our humble praise we bring.

Clasp to your hearts the Babe who laid on straw,
A life of woe for us already drags;
So lov'd—to love be now our sacred law.

The translator was thinking of the poetry only—and not the music—when he so constructed his verse as to have the second lines of a pair of stanzas rhyming.

In his "Annus Sanctus," Mr. Orby Shipley includes the Catholic translations of J. C. Earle (1881), J. Richard Beste (1839), Charles Kent (1870-1883) and Robert Campbell (?). The version of Campbell was probably made before his conversion. With the exception of Campbell's, I do not think that any of these translations have come into hymnal use, as their rhythms do not fit in with those of the Latin text, and doubtless were not meant to fit in. That of Earle translates all the eight stanzas of the Latin text. All the versions are fully rhymed, except that of Campbell, which simply rhymes the second and fourth lines. To illustrate them, I may be allowed to avoid monotony by taking stanzas in the order of the "English Cento":

1. (J. C. Earle).

In triumph, joy and holy fear,
Draw near, ye faithful souls, draw near;
The Infant King of heaven is here:
None treads aright but Bethlehemward;
Come hither and adore the Lord.

2. (J. R. Beste.)

God of the Godhead, true Light unabated,
Mary the Virgin has borne the Adored;
True God eternal, begot, uncreated—
Oh, come and kneel before Him;
Oh, come and all adore Him;
Oh, come, Oh, come, rejoicing to honor the Lord.

3. (C. Kent).

Hark, angelic paeans sounding
Fill heaven's vault with song astounding,
Song sweet peace to earth now bringing:
Chant thou, "Glory in the highest,"
To the God for whom thou sighest:
Come, with thoughts to heaven upsoaring;
Come, with lowly knees adoring;
Come, angelic anthems singing.

4. (R. Campbell).

All glory forever to Thee, Blessed Jesus,
Born to rescue the fallen from woe and despair;
True Word of the Father, eternal, incarnate;
With glad alleluias His glory declare.

All of these translations are excellently rhymed. But while the version of R. Campbell is given in "The Westminster Hymnal for Congregational Use," edited by Henri C. Hemy (London, s. d.), the rhythm is not the same throughout. The first stanza can be well set to the traditional tune; but the other stanzas can be sung to the tune only with the greatest difficulty. Let me conclude this section of my theme by quoting from an original translation (it is given in full in the "Catholic Educational Review" for January, 1915, p. 16) which is fully rhymed, but is so rhythmized as to fit in

with the musical accents of the traditional tune. The first stanza will suffice to illustrate:

1.

Come ye with gladness,
Banishing all sadness;
Joyful to Bethlehem your praises bring:
See, to us given,
Christ, the King of Heaven!

While angels hover o'er Him
And shepherds kneel before Him,
O let us, too, adore Him,
Our God and King!

TUNES OTHER THAN THE TRADITIONAL ONE.

The "Arundel Hymns" makes a distinction which, for ears accustomed (as those of English-speaking people are) to an inseparable union of the traditional tune with the "English Cento" of the Latin text, is worthy of commendation. We find in this volume that the English Cento is set to the traditional tune, and that the French Cento and its English translation are printed on a page facing a melody composed by R. L. de Pearsall, of Willsbridge, and marked "Second Tune."

The "De La Salle Hymnal," edited by the Brothers of the Christian Schools (New York, 1913) gives the traditional tune to the Latin text, but has a different melody for the English translation. This setting is ascribed to "Lerler." Let me quote a stanza:

Come, all ye faithful, join the march triumphant,
And hasten, hasten to Bethlehem;
Within the crib there lies the true, the great Messiah.
Oh, come and let us worship Christ the Lord.

This hymnal is a revision, well executed, of the "Catholic Youth's Hymn Book" (New York, 1885) previously edited by the Christian Brothers. They have very felicitously omitted the translation, "With hearts truly grateful," which had appeared in the 1885 volume. The setting of "Lerler" (without his name being given) is in the 1885 volume, to a simpler (and, I think, a better) stanzaic form:

Come, all ye faithful, joyful and triumphant,
O hasten, O hasten, to Bethlehem;
See in a manger the Monarch of angels.
O come and let us worship Christ the Lord.

The setting is an abbreviated form of the music as given in "Peters' Sodality Hymn Book" (New York, 1872) and as there ascribed to "Lerler." This, in turn, appears to have been taken from "The Popular Hymn and Tune Book" edited by Frederick Westlake for Catholic use (London, 1868). The mystery of "Lerler" is there solved, the setting being ascribed to Henry Leslie. How

"Leslie" became transformed to "Lerler" experts in handwriting may surmise.

No less than three tunes are assigned to our hymn in "The Hymnal (Episcopalian), with music as used in Trinity Church, New York" (New York, 1893). First of all, we have Oakeley's translation, revised and altered, to the traditional tune, which here is ascribed to "J. Reading, 1680" (while the Latin text is ascribed to the "seventeenth century"). Next we find the same version set to music by J. Barnby, 1866. Finally, we have Father Caswall's translation set to music by H. Smart (with additions).

Not a different setting, but rather an invasion upon the prescriptive rights of the traditional tune, is given in the "Holy Face Hymnal" (New York, 1891). The first eight measures are given to *sol*i, and are then repeated by *chor*us. The *sol*i take the rest of the stanza, and a *chor*us of three voices takes the repetition ("Natum videte," etc.)

H. T. HENRY.

Overbrook, Pa.

THE CATHOLIC ELEMENT IN ENGLISH POETRY.

THE subject of the Catholic element in English poetry is indeed a vast and extended one. It involves an investigation as to how far Catholic truth has pervaded the great body of English poetry from the days of Chaucer to our own. It will be found, too, that many English poets, while not professing the Catholic faith, have directly or indirectly been inspired by its teachings and guided by its sane and lofty tenets. Because a great and true poet, no matter at what altar he may kneel, works towards the ideal of Catholic truth. For all great Christian poetry is but the flowering of Catholic truth.

The schism of the sixteenth century darkened the stream of English literature, but it did not entirely cut off the vision of the poet from that eternal beauty whose abode is the bosom of God. Glints of Catholic truth then will be found running through all English poetry.

Aristotle says that all great poetry has a philosophy. Yes, and poetry, being one of the greatest of the arts, stands also for an ideal. This ideal embodies the soul of the people, whether that people be Oriental, Greek, Roman, mediæval or modern. To understand a poem properly we must re-create it in the times and under the skies which yielded their nurturing dews. How can we expect to understand Aristophanes if all do not know Greek life, or Horace if we do not know Roman life, or yet Dante if we have not studied mediæval life? To know the times is to re-create the poem.

Every race or people, then, stand for an ideal. In the East it was fatalism, in Greece it was beauty, in Rome under the Cæsars it was the majesty of law. To-day in German literature the dominant note is the philosophical, in English literature it is individualism, in French literature it is the social, in Italian the artistic and in Spanish the chivalric.

In ancient pagan days all art ministered to the senses, but the primary purpose of Christian art is to minister to the soul. With the advent of Christ a new meaning was breathed into art. It took "ten silent centuries" to give the world a Dante, the first great poetic flower raised in the gardens of Catholic truth. It took as many centuries to give us the "Summa" of St. Thomas Aquinas. All art is a century plant, with its roots deep in the past. What are the "Canterbury Tales" but a reflection of mediæval England? They are Catholic because mediæval England was Catholic. Nothing could be so absurd as to doubt the Catholicity of Chaucer. The late distinguished Chaucerian scholar, Professor Lounsbury, of

Yale University, settled forever this question. Chaucer criticizes the monks, and Dante puts a Pope in hell. Notwithstanding this both are orthodox Catholics. Chaucer belonged to a rival order of the monks, the military order, and the Ghebbeline Dante makes his damned talk politics in hell. Surely this sufficiently explains the reason for the attitude of these two points. Both Dante and Chaucer died in the bosom of the Catholic Church.

To understand fully what part Catholic truth has played in English poetry we must realize that it has been from the altar of Catholic truth that the spiritual torch of poetry has gone forth and been handed down the centuries—from Chaucer across those twilight years when England was more concerned in the affairs of war than in the arts of peace to Spenser, and from Spenser to that myriad-minded dramatist, William Shakespeare, whose mind has been likened to an ocean whose waves touched all the shores of human thought and upon whose bosom played all the sunshine and tempest of passion, and from Shakespeare to that chief of English epic writers, who trod the heavens shod in the rainbow light of epic glory, John Milton, and from Milton across the dry Pompeiian period to that high priest of nature, William Wordsworth, whose altar lamp had burned unheeded during the reign of the correct school of poets, and from Wordsworth down to the poets who seemed to have passed away but yesterday—to Rossetti and Tennyson and Browning.

It is worthy of noting that the value of art depends upon the spiritual endowment of its age or epoch. It is the Olympian and Pantheistic Goethe who tells us that "The epochs in which faith prevails are the marked epochs of human history, full of heart-stirring memories and substantial gains for all after times. The epochs in which unbelief prevails, even when for the moment they have put on the semblance of glory and success, inevitably sink into insignificance in the eyes of posterity, which will not waste its thoughts on things barren and unfruitful.

If we take, for instance, the three periods in literature represented by Dante, Spenser and Shelley—that is, the Middle Ages, the English Renaissance and the Age of Revolution—it will be seen at a glance that the time of Dante, which is known as the Ages of Faith, is because of its great spiritual endowment the greatest art epoch of the three. Take, for instance, the representative poems of these three periods—"The Divine Comedy," "The Fairie Queene" and "Prometheus Unbound." As Miss Veda Scudder points out in her scholarly work, "The Life of the Spirit in the Modern English Poets." When you compare the representative works of these three poets, there is no doubting which is the greatest age and which is

the greatest poem. "The Divine Comedy" was completed in 1319, the "Fairie Queene" in 1596 and "Prometheus Unbound" in 1819. The age of Dante was an age of contemplation, the age of Spenser an age of adventure and the age of Shelley an age of revolution. The problems in these three poems reflect the spirit of the times. With Dante the problem is the purification of the soul; with Spenser, the routing of the powers of wrong, and with Shelley, the liberation of the soul. Miss Scudder sums up her estimate of the two protagonists in "Prometheus Unbound" and the "Divine Comedy" in these words: "Prometheus is an abstraction, Dante is a summary. Prometheus is a man as dreamed by a poet, Dante is a man as created by God. And the thought of God proves the greater." It will thus be seen that poetry is never greater than the spiritual endowment of the age in which it takes form. In truth, it derives its very accent from this spiritual endowment.

All art reflects the times in which it has birth, but it draws its nourishment from the past. Its roots strike deeply down. Take, for instance, Shakespeare. While he belongs to the Elizabethan age of literature, his genius has been fed and enriched by the centuries of Catholic faith in England, when men's souls joyed in the things of God, when the shrine of the Blessed Virgin stood by the wayside and the mystery and morality plays of Chester and York touched and stirred men's souls.

Yet it is very doubtful if there is any satisfactory evidence that Shakespeare was in any way attached to the Catholic Church. It is pretty certain that his father and mother were Catholics. But this was an age in England of the disintegration of the ancient faith. No doubt Shakespeare had a warm place in his heart for the Church of his fathers. In no instance does he ridicule her tenets in his masterly dramas. However, from this fact we cannot conclude that Shakespeare was a Catholic. Great art demands Catholic truth, and Shakespeare would not be the great dramatist that he is had he stooped to the ridiculing of the tenets of the Catholic Church in his dramatic creations. This fidelity to fact and truth of life, this sympathy with the spiritual tenets of the soul, marks the work of the supreme artist in every age.

We know full well that there are many scholars and writers who hold that Shakespeare was a Catholic. I must say that I cannot accept this judgment or conclusion. Shakespeare lived at a time when to my mind religion touched very lightly the souls of the English people. Many of the dramatists of the time were profligates, and profligacy and the practices of the Catholic faith do not go very well together. Men of genius, unfortunately, are often not very religious. They realize better far than ordinary mortals

what a part the spiritual plays in the growth of the soul and in the profession and growth of character, but often in proportion as God has dowered them with vision beyond men, they are dragged down by the tyranny of the flesh. But if Shakespeare was not a Catholic, he certainly in his plays, as Carlyle says, voices the Catholicity of the Middle Ages. Queen Elizabeth, by Act of Parliament, destroyed the ancient Church in England, but her decree could not touch the Catholic life of England in the past, for the Catholic Church is the most immortal of things, and her life and the fruit of her life in art live on forever. It was this Catholic life that inspired Shakespeare and in many instances gave him plot and story.

If we appeal to Shakespeare for internal evidence to prove that he was a Catholic, we but weaken and make ridiculous our position, for every dramatist must be true not only to the setting of his drama, but to the psychology of his characters. It is no proof, then, to cite the case of Hamlet's father coming from purgatory to tell his son of his "murder most foul" that Shakespeare believed in purgatory. The tragedy of Hamlet belongs to a time in Denmark when all its people professed the Catholic faith, and, besides the need of bringing Hamlet's father from purgatory for dramatic purposes, Shakespeare was compelled by the very setting of his drama to touch its life in the unfolding with the chrism of the ancient faith.

Let us suppose that three centuries hence a discussion arose as to the religion of the poet Longfellow. We can imagine some one citing passages in his touching idyll of "Evangeline"—the one, for instance, describing the heroine's beautiful countenance, "when after confession homeward serenely she walked with God's benediction upon her," or that beautiful and sympathetic picture of Father Felician, the village priest, whom all the children greeted as he passed down the street, and who with uplifted hand reverently blessed them. Surely, too, these passages, so full of Catholic life and color, might be well cited to prove that Longfellow was a Catholic. They are certainly as convincing as the Ghost in "Hamlet." But the truth is that neither affords any evidence of the religion of Shakespeare or Longfellow.

When we pass from Shakespeare to John Milton, we pass to a poet not only entirely devoid of Catholic sympathy, but a poet whose rigid Puritanism deprived his epic art of those Catholic symbols and Catholic legends and Catholic traditions which give color and life and artistry to the highest dreams of the soul. Milton's great epic, "Paradise Lost," is but a torso. It lacks artistic unity. It is only great in passages or patches. Unlike to the "Divine Com-

edy," which has all the artistic unity of Catholic truth, this splendid English epic, though rioting in imagery and the supernatural, lacks this artistic unity, and, lacking this, falls below as a work of art the supreme achievement of the great Florentine poet.

Passing from Milton to Alexander Pope, the culmination of the Correct School of Poetry, we are face to face with a truth well worth observing. It is this: A poet may live a Catholic and die a Catholic and yet put nothing of his faith into his work. Pope is certainly a case in point. Pope professed and practiced the Catholic religion, and yet you will look in vain for any evidence of it in his poetry. He seemed to be under the spell of the false philosophy of Lord Bolingbroke, his chief poem being saturated with this.

Now William Wordsworth, the head of the School of Nature and Romance, is a case in point where a poet may not profess the Catholic faith and yet teach Catholic truths—nay, give evidence in his work that the beautiful truths, teachings and dogmas of the Catholic Church may inspire at times the soul of the poet no matter at what altar he kneels.

I remember that when I visited the Wordsworth land in the summer of 1903 I was fortunate enough to meet a venerable octogenarian who had been an intimate friend of the Wordsworth family. In our conversation touching Wordsworth I elicited from him the fact that while the poet was an Anglican, there was not anything of the Ritualist in him. He was rather what might be termed a Broad Churchman to-day. In view of this Wordsworth's beautiful sonnet on the Blessed Virgin, where he pays tribute and homage to the Mother of God as "Our tainted nature's solitary boast," is indeed remarkable. Despite the fact of Wordsworth's anti-Catholic prejudice, which is revealed in some of his ecclesiastical sonnets, this High Priest and Vicegerent of Nature pays homage to the Mother of God in lines that might have been penned by a Cardinal Newman or a Father Faber.

When we turn to the poets of our own time—to the poets at whose graves we seemed to stand, as it were, but yesterday—Dante, Gabriel Rossetti, Robert Browning and Alfred Tennyson—we see what a large part Catholic truth played in their best work. It was Rossetti that restored to English poetry the mediæval temper of wonder, and this is peculiarly a characteristic of the Ages of Faith. In reading Rossetti's poetry you feel something of the mystery that lurks in the dim aisles of a Gothic Cathedral.

Browning was of Nonconformist origin, and in many a poem does grievous wrong to the Catholic Church, yet his most considerable poem, that massive epic, "The Ring and the Book," which is essentially Catholic in theme if not wholly so in treatment, bears

witness to the fact that the great monologist was at his best when he was most sincere and faithful in his portrayal of Catholic character.

Tennyson went to a Catholic subject to build up what he regarded as his best and noblest poem, "The Idylls of the King." No need to say that this is essentially Catholic. It has its setting in Catholic times, and you will do well not to read it through the glasses of twentieth century doubt and skepticism. But even Tennyson's splendid elegy, "In Memoriam," though regarded by many as a poem of doubt, beats and pulses in many a passage to the divine music of Catholic truth. When the sorrow in it sinks or passes from the sensuous to the sanctified, we feel the truth of Dante's words, "In sua volontà è nostra pace." Surely indeed the Catholic element in English poetry is very considerable.

THOMAS O'HAGAN.

Paisley, Ontario.

PLATO AND BERGSON—A COMPARISON AND A CONTRAST.

Plato	Dialogues
Plato	Republic
Bergson*	Creative Evolution
Bergson	Introduction to Metaphysics
Bergson	Matter and Memory
Kallen	William James and Henri Bergson
Father Gerrard	Bergson
Hibbert Journal	October, 1911
Perrier	Revival of Scholastic Phil.
Paulsen	Introduction to Ethics
Chesterton	Heretics
Chesterton	Orthodoxy
Schiller, F. C. G.	Studies in Humanism

AT FIRST glance no two leaders in Philosophy could seem further apart than the author of the *Dialogues*, with his insistence on the "colorless, formless, impalpable existence" which is unsensed, changeless, eternal, and Bergson, that brilliant modern Heraclitus, the reviver of the ancient doctrine of the perpetual flux under a new title of his own contriving—"Creative Evolution." And yet with all their divergences, these two have many points of contact. They agree, under occasional modification, in positing:

(a) The essential inadequacy of mechanistic theories of life and the universe.

(b) The ideal genesis of matter.

(c) The natural incommensurability of philosophy and science and the value of supra-intellectual vision or intuition.

(d) Antagonistic cosmic currents of ascent and descent as explanatory of consciousness and matter, freedom and necessity, good and evil.

Though these agreements are vital, Bergson has penned many a philippic against Plato and Platonism. "There is," William James writes somewhere, "very little difference between one man and another, but what little there is, is very important." The ascendant differences between Bergson and Plato lie along two main lines:

I. Being vs. Becoming. (Duration—Time.)

II. Causality—Final vs. Proximate (Reality).

The first significant parallelism in the two systems concerns the inadequacy of materialistic and mechanistic theories of life and the universe. Mechanistic explanations regard past and future as calculable functions of the present, thus claiming that all is given. There is no place for freedom. In the Platonic schema, the creation of the world is a resultant of the goodness of God harmonically

*Note: In text, C. E.—Creative Evolution, Bergson's principal work.

reflected in time, "the moving image of eternity." God made the world good, wishing everything to be like Himself. To this end, He brought order into it and endowed it with soul. (Tim. xxix., 30.) It is made after those eternal and unchanging patterns—the perfect, invisible Ideas. Matter is, in one sense, "an elusive nothing that creeps between the Ideas, creating endless agitation, eternal disquiet like a suspicion insinuated between two loving hearts." Ideas, the divine Ideas, are the whole of intelligible reality, that is to say of truth, in that they represent the theoretical equilibrium of Being. As to sensible reality, it is a continual oscillation from one side to the other of this point of equilibrium. A non-mechanistic theory as truly as Bergson's own, for all that Plato derives motion from the immutable, becoming from being, as a sort of falling from grace, while Bergson makes the creative evolutionary whirl initial in every instance. As against mechanism, Bergson points out that in considering reality, it is obsessed by the mere facts of similarity and repetition. But since all changes, the concrete actuality never recurs in time. Repetition is impossible, therefore, save in the abstract. The unforeseen, the adventure which is life itself, is forever unfolding as a refutation of the logic and the geometry of the mechanists. "The more the geometry in mechanism is emphasized, the less can mechanism admit that anything is ever created, even pure form. Inasmuch as we are geometricians, then, we reject the unforeseeable. We might accept it assuredly, insofar as we are artists, for art lives on creation and implies a latent belief in the spontaneity of nature." (C. E., 45.)

Plato and Bergson agree, in the second place, as to the ideal genesis of matter. "Extension," says Bergson, "appears only as a tension which is interrupted." (C. E., 245.) The real, he holds, can pass from tension to extension, from freedom to mechanical necessity by simple inversion. "What then," he asks, "is the principle that has only to let go its tension—may we say to detend?—in order to extend, the interruption of the cause here being equivalent to a reversal of the effect? For want of a better word we have called it consciousness." (C. E., 237.) When by a painful effort we succeed in making the faculty of seeing one with that of willing, when we look no longer with the eyes of the intellect, but with those of the undivided soul, then shall we see this tension and extension as a single process, "an action which is making itself across an action of the same kind which is unmaking itself, like the fiery path torn by the last rocket of a fireworks display through the black embers of the spent rockets that are falling dead." (C. E., 251.) Thus is matter ideal in its genesis. Plato, within the limits imposed by the undeveloped state of the positive sciences in his time, is equally

insistent upon the priority of mind. "Creation," he tells us in his leisurely way, "is mixed, being made up of necessity and mind. Mind, the ruling power, persuaded necessity to bring the greater part of created things to perfection, and thus in the beginning reason got the better of necessity, and the universe was created." (Tim. xlviii.) "The soul is the eldest of all things which are born and is immortal and rules over all bodies." (Laws xii., 968.) The earth is not a mass of dead matter, but a living being. God is immanent in the world by His creation and government of it; transcendent by His nature and attributes. Nature, though containing a remnant of chaos and disorder, is shot through with mind, is a glorious reflection of the beauty invisible and is worthy of an admiration approaching worship.

The third line of agreement centres in the relations of Philosophy and Science. Logic, our philosophers decide, is instrumental in its function. Those organized bodies of knowledge which constitute the various sciences, are simply by-products of this instrumental functioning. Philosophy, as Science, utilizes the data of sense, both allow. But, they hasten to add, Philosophy has access to levels of experience not reached by sense or science, levels of intuition which are of insight rather than of reason, or of reason only when that term is used in its Platonic sense as something higher than intellect. This region of higher psychical activity is supra-intellectual and distinct from those infra-intellectual channels which, for all practical purposes, are coincident with instinct. However, as Bergson suggests, sensuous instinct may be in continuity with supra-intellectual instinct through certain intermediaries, as infra-red is continuous with ultra-violet. Intuition, with its registry of the deeper, more urgent currents of the soul, represents the uncharted, unexplored regions of the inner life of man. "It throws a gleam," says Bergson, "faint but steady, upon subjects of the greatest interest to us, and about which the intellect cannot tell us all we wish to know upon our personality, our freedom, our relations to the universe as a whole, our origin, perhaps our destiny. Intuition is instinct that has become self-conscious and disinterested, capable of reflecting upon its object, discerning dimly new relations and significances indefinitely defined, if one may be pardoned the paradox. Its sudden, sometimes almost painful, turning back of consciousness upon itself unifies the faculties of seeing and willing. If these fugitive, incomplete moments could be sustained and prolonged, the curtain might ascend on the stage of reality, disclosing the answers to some of the haunting queries of the human heart. Plato, five centuries before Christianity, was as conscious as Bergson of this undeveloped potency in the human soul. He has de-

scribed it unmistakably. According to the Platonic theory, intuition enfolds the soul's remembrance of the Infinitely Perfect upon which she gazed in her cycles of preëxistence. Men, in general, recall with difficulty the things of the other world, but the mind of a philosopher is more retentive. Therefore, the lover of wisdom, even in this life, may recall the images and illuminations of the heavenly life. The sophists, relying upon the senses only, and lacking those intimations of immortality which haunt the hearts of genuine seekers after truth, are incapable of arriving at a knowledge of reality. They are purveyors of opinion. The senses can serve merely as ladders to knowledge, not as final bases for rational faith. "The heart hath its reasons." The approval of the great Teacher was for those "who have not seen, but have believed," for the psychical is wider than the cerebral reflex of the physical.

Our two philosophers coincide, further, in positing a double antagonistic cosmic movement of ascent and descent in two opposing streams—consciousness and matter, freedom and necessity, good and evil. "Matter, the reality which descends, endures only by its connection with that which ascends. But life and consciousness are this very ascension." (C. E., 396.) "Matter is a relaxation of the inextensive into the extensive, and thereby of liberty into necessity." (C. E., 218.) "Consciousness, or supra-consciousness, is the name for the rocket whose extinguished fragments fall back as matter." (C. E., 261.) Matter is "a flux rather than a thing," but its flow is in the opaquant direction to that of spirit. The flux of spirit is towards creative evolution; the movement of matter aims at routine stability, a present forever renewed in its identity. Plato, too, has his cycles wherein the spiritual and material separate, unite and interchange. The movements are large; the time required definite—one thousand years. "There is a time when God Himself guides and helps to roll the world in its course; and there is a time, on the completion of a certain cycle, when He lets go, and the world being a living creature and having originally received intelligence from its Author and Creator, turns about and by an inherent necessity revolves in the opposite direction." (Statesman, 269.) God directs when action is free and good; evil results from the interpenetration of matter which sets loose a universal becoming under necessity. Degrade the divine and immutable Ideas; by that alone you obtain the perpetual flux. The movement as described by Plato is a descent from the perfection of the world of true Being with its imperishable Ideas to the imperfection of the world of Becoming, of space, time, growth and decay. The return of the soul from the body to the supra-sensible sphere is an ascent; the sojourn of the soul in the body begins as a descent and con-

tinues as an exile. Both Plato and Aristotle interpret the cosmic movements as evidence of the aspiration of life towards the divine perfection, and therefore an attempt to ascend God-wards. The Alexandrians amplified these dual motions in their expositions of procession and conversion. Everything, they taught, is derived from a first principle and seeks to return when separated from its beginning.

Finally, both Plato and Bergson regard human freedom as real and human perfectibility as possible. Says Bergson: "The rôle of life is to insert some indetermination into matter." (C. E., 126.) "When we put back our being into our will, and our will itself into the impulsion it prolongs, we understand, we feel, that reality is a perpetual growth, a creation pursued without end. Our will already performs this miracle. Every human act in which there is invention, every voluntary act in which there is freedom, every movement of the organism that manifests spontaneity, brings something new into the world." (C. E., 239.) "Radical is the difference between animal consciousness, even the most intelligent, and human consciousness. For consciousness corresponds exactly to the living being's power of choice; it is coextensive with the fringe of possible action that surrounds the real action; consciousness is synonymous with invention and freedom. Now, in the animal, invention is never anything but a variation on the theme of routine. Shut up in the habits of the species, it succeeds, no doubt, in enlarging them by its individual initiative, but it escapes automatism only for an instant, for just the time to create a new automatism. With man, consciousness breaks the chain. In man, and man alone, it sets itself free." (C. E., 264.) Plato, who accepts reincarnation, regards the soul as having the opportunity before birth in any one cycle to choose the nature and conditions of the life upon which it is about to enter. In the Tenth Book of "The Republic" the prophet makes a proclamation granting choice of future circumstances in the world below to the unborn souls. "Hear the word of Lachesis, daughter of necessity. Mortal souls, behold a new cycle of life and mortality. Your genius will not be allotted to you, but you will choose your genius, and let him who draws the first lot have the first choice. And the life which he chooses shall be his destiny. Virtue is free, and as a man honors or dishonors her, he will have more or less of her; the responsibility is with the chooser. God is justified." (Rep. x., 617.) "For the formation of character, God left to the wills of individuals. Every one of us is made what he is by the bent of his desires and the nature of his soul." (Laws x., 904.) The assertion by the soul itself of the soul's freedom is so emphatic as to make it one of the most immediate of the data of

consciousness. Even the fire-eating advocates of scientific mechanism are inclined, when describing the human spirit, to accede to it at least moments of perfect freedom.

In enumerating these points of agreement, we must not minimize those divergences where the brilliant modern and the more brilliant ancient at last part company, agreeing to disagree in a spirit of gentle irony, but with all due philosophic serenity. Their dissent hinges upon the pivotal problems of (a) Being, Becoming (Duration—Time), (b) Causality, Final vs. Proximate (Reality). Plato's great mission was the unveiling of a universe of unchangeable reality, which in its highest theoretic development became the invisible world of unmoved Perfection, where the divine Ideas of Truth, Goodness, Beauty and Justice shine in undiminished splendor, the same yesterday, to-day and forever. Through these Ideas we come into communion with the basaltic foundation of things, those things which endure unshaken by the torrential abrasions of sense-affecting phenomena. Zeno had proved to the satisfaction of the Eleatics the unreality, the unthinkableableness of change of motion of any sort. Parmenides has elaborated this physical theory into a metaphysical unfolding of the nullity of Becoming and the reality of pure Being. Plato, building upon both, divined the opposition of what is to what appears, of the rational to the sensible, of the One to the many, of that which remains forever and that which, passing, is no more. Having posited immutability as belonging to the world of Ideas, the world of reality, change must be regarded as a diminution of perfection, an attribute of the unreal. This awful chasm between existence and apparent existence has yawned dark and wide through all the twenty-four post-Platonic centuries. It is there, open, unexplained, if we accept Plato; it never existed, except in the imaginations of the philosophers who advocate it, if we follow Bergson. This is the main cross-roads corner of the two philosophies; let the wayfarer choose. Bergson is for Becoming, for that ceaseless movement nowhether or somewhither which he calls "creative evolution." All things change. Alps are leveled into valleys; empires fashioned by a Napoleon melt into democracies conceived in the phlegmatic minds of his slow-witted followers; the sun itself, as Pater observes, goes out only a little more slowly than the human eye. "Mobility is life; 'tis the dead things that are most completely at rest," explained Heraclitus in a dim past which knew not Plato. Bergson but repeats this summation in a modern jargon which includes a cosmic ascent of consciousness, a synchronal descent of matter and unfailing faith in the mutable, the perfectible. Worked out to its ultimate absurdity, this position requires the assumption that the first cause is non-being. But as the system

is alogical, this need not worry us. If, in an intuitional flash, one of these pseudo-philosophers should decide upon a personal God as the explanation of things, in another flash he would accord to this divinity mutation and perfectibility. Through the ages the discerning heart of humanity has rested its faith upon a changeless, all-perfect Creator. It would seem that the faith of the millions ought to have some weight, even with a philosopher.

It is not easy to understand why M. Bergson, and indeed the whole school of modernist philosophers, should prefer a variable God to an unchanging, all-perfect one. Perhaps because of a confusion in the use of undefined terms. A study of St. Thomas and his differentiation of actuality from potentiality might help to clear matters up. Modernists develop the whirl of the fitful fever we call life into a concept of an evolutionary cosmic flux which is to take the place of God. Their mistake is not that of speaking of God in the language-poems of humanity. That we all do, nor can we do otherwise. Their mistake is in not seeing the inadequacy of such forms, when the object of the description is unspeakable reality. They confuse unchangeable with inactive. Now, we know our own lives are incomplete; that every hour brings new experiences; that we are forever passing from potentiality to actuality. God, however, since He is absolute perfection, is incapable of acquiring any new perfection. His non-liability to change is assuredly not due to exhaustion or want of activity, but to a completeness and fullness of activity which precludes transition from any present potentiality to a future actuality. "The life which we attribute to God is of the most immanent kind," says Father Gerrard, "a life wholly different from ours, for it is all pure actuality. Ours is only a participation in life, and so we are said to possess life. But God is all life, and so we say that He is life. No one gives it to Him; He is it from all eternity." The Schoolmen frequently define God as "*actus purus*," or pure activity, and Dante, who follows them rather closely, refers to the Creator as the "unmoved mover" of all things. There is a spiritual motion so intense, at such white heat of fervent life, that by the unthinking it is often mistaken for dead immobility. Even in the world of physical matter, the vortex of a whirling substance may appear motionless from sheer rapidity of movement. To the rhythmic pulse of our own planet-home as it sways through space, we are insensible; the awful velocities of the so-called "fixed stars" impress our imperfect sense-avenues as quiescence God might be, after Bergson's dim guess, "a centre from which worlds shoot out like rockets in a fireworks display," and yet remain the unmoved Rock of Ages as portrayed in the symbolism of Christian art and letters. But Bergson does not

quite see the compatibility of the two notions. In the meantime he holds fast to the god of change, not the unchanging One; to the god of time, not the God of eternity.

As a matter of fact, Bergson rejects perfection as an attained ultimate, while Plato cannot conceive the final cause as perfectible. Finalism, of any sort, is almost as bad a solution as mechanism, according to Bergson. He will have no end set at the beginning, thus limiting at the outset such spontaneity as is allowed. A. J. Balfour's comment on this is worth noting: "Creation, freedom, will—these doubtless are great things; but we cannot everlastingly admire them unless we know their drift. We cannot, I submit, rest satisfied with what differs so little from the haphazard; joy is no fitting consequence of efforts which are so nearly aimless. If *values* are to be taken into account, it is surely better to invoke God with a purpose than supra-consciousness with none." (Hibbert Jour., Oct., 1911.) All things—the demand is the most clamorous of the many made by the heart of humanity—all things must work together for good. "If the world be indeed fair and its Artificer good, it is manifest that He must have fashioned His work after an eternal and perfect pattern. . . . God desired that all things should be good and nothing bad, so far as that was attainable." (Tim. xxx.) Somewhere in his "Creative Evolution" Bergson hazards the opinion that intuition, if it could be prolonged beyond a few instants, would not only make a philosopher consistent with himself at all levels of thought, but also all philosophers consistent with one another. Insofar, then, as Bergson and Plato both possess this gift of genuine philosophic vision, they ought to agree; their differences must be due to the fugitive, undeveloped state of intuition as a power of the human soul. One cannot help wishing, after a careful study of M. Bergson, that he may have an opportunity to re-read his Plato. As for Plato, let us forbear offering anything so presumptuous as advice for the improvement of his serene and reverend spirit. He was a Christian by desire. No doubt his contemplation of the unveiled Idea of the good has long since corrected such errors as he stumbled into in his quest for truth.

M. A. DUNNE.

Chicago, Ill.

CARDINAL LAVIGERIE AS AN ARCHÆOLOGIST.

DISCOVERY OF CHRISTIAN AND PAGAN CEMETERIES IN CARTHAGE.

IN THE January number of the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW I endeavored to give a brief sketch of Cardinal Lavigerie as a missionary. It is now my purpose to show the results of discoveries and excavations made among the ruins of ancient Carthage, under his patronage and direction. It will be seen that he was not only a great missionary, a great Bishop and a great statesman, but that he also possessed a mind capable of seeing and grasping things outside of those with which his sacred calling would naturally bring him in contact.

His interest in the archæology of the Dark Continent, and especially that of the ancient city of Carthage, is evinced in his highly interesting and instructive work, entitled *Nécessité d'une Mission Archéologique Permanente à Carthage*. In the Rev. Father Delatre, Cardinal Lavigerie found an untiring and intelligent co-worker in the task of unearthing stone, sepulchral lamp and monument. Epitaphs have been cleaned off and deciphered, and the emblems designed upon the lamps explained to such a degree as to throw no little light on the trials of the early Christians in Carthage, the great African metropolis of their period.

The student of history will recall that in the year B. C. 202 Scipio invaded Carthage and carried it by assault. The African rulers became his subjects; their armies were defeated, Hannibal was no longer able to defend his country, and Scipio established his rule and, as a reward for his triumphs, had conferred upon him the title of Africanus.

Roman rule was followed by the Roman religion, the gods of Rome supplanted the deities of the Carthaginians, and Carthage, once the mistress of Africa, of the Mediterranean and of the commerce of the world, was now forced to bow under the yoke that Scipio had placed upon her shoulders. Roman nobles settled in and around Carthage, bringing their freedmen and their bondsmen with them, building their palaces and their villas, and, in a word, becoming the lords of Africa.

Until within a comparatively recent period very little was known outside of Rome and Italy about cemeteries set aside for the exclusive interment of the bondsmen of the imperial house in Africa. These bondsmen were not considered to have been sufficiently numerous to warrant them a special place of burial. It is true that some seven or eight epitaphs telling of such burials were found at Lambesi, Citra and elsewhere in Africa, but nothing indicated

that the number of slaves in the immediate vicinity of Carthage was large enough to require a special cemetery for their use. Cardinal Lavigerie and Father Delatre have removed all doubts on this subject.

The slave cemeteries discovered under the patronage of Cardinal Lavigerie were situated under the ancient ramparts destroyed by Scipio and which once constituted the walls of Carthage. The winds that blew from the African desert and the sand clouds they carried with them alternately bared and covered the long forgotten tombs. The existence of a cemetery on the west side of the ramparts was revealed, but it attracted little notice and was soon "buried again out of sight" and remained so when the Vandals invaded and sacked Carthage.

Thus it came to pass that the humble resting place of the bondsmen were preserved, while those of their proud masters, which the winds had bared, were violated, despoiled and shattered to pieces. A few years ago, Cardinal Lavigerie tells us, a garden covered those humble tombs, and the Arab who cultivated it, on May 10, 1880, found at a depth of some eighteen inches below the surface of the ground, as it was then, the round dome or *cupa* of one of these sepultered crypts, on one side of which was found the following inscription:

DISMANIBVS SACR | CRESCENS CAESARIS N. SE.
| PIVS VIX ANNIS LXXL | H. S. C.

This Arab, Matiouki by name, is one of Father Delatre's men, and he lost no time in making his discovery known. The Cardinal was at the Jesuit College of St. Louis (Byrsa) when the Arab made this announcement, and both he and Father Delatre urged him to continue his researches. On the following day he uncovered four new inscriptions like the first one—epitaphs on the tombs of some of Cæsar's bondsmen. Near the crypt first discovered the Arab found two more, and instead of removing the earth that covered them, which would have entailed no little labor and would have interfered with the product of his garden, he burrowed a sort of molelike tunnel, along which he could crawl and breathe. In this manner he managed to get some 277 inscriptions.

But the Cardinal and Father Delatre were now anxious to learn the arrangement of this cemetery so strangely brought to light. In this they were doomed to disappointment, for the Arab would suffer no disturbance of his garden so long as it was under cultivation. It was not until the month of November that the work of excavation could be undertaken with energy and the workmen succeeded in bringing to light the entire cemetery.

Cardinal Lavigerie says he can only compare it to the cemeteries

of the period found in and near large cities, especially the parts where the tombs are built of masonry.

The cemetery was found to consist of a series of irregular crypts, the upper portions of which were sometimes round, while others were flat, and all so close together as to render it difficult at times to pass between them. Among the inscriptions was found one in which a freedman deplored, with a feeling of the deepest filial piety, his inability to give the tomb of his parents, both of whom had been slaves, larger proportions.

Father Delatre took the measurement of some of these tombs and gives a somewhat detailed account of his observations. He says:

"The necropolis of Cæsar's bondsmen occupies a space of about two and a half acres. With the exception of a vault containing a skeleton and an urn filled with ashes, all the tombs consisted of rectangular crypts, surmounted by a simple and not very prominent cornice, and sometimes capped by a semi-cylindrical dome, with a sort of decoration at each corner, but more frequently forming a pedestal. Each crypt, built of masonry, contained several urns; the principal or more important one of these occupied a central place, and was protected by a *patera* having a hole in it through which a terra cotta tube extends and leads to the upper part of the crypt. When the vase or urn was enclosed in masonry there was a semi-spherical niche which extended over urns, lamps and lachrymaries.

"When a crypt contained several urns, the largest one was placed in the middle. It had its terra cotta tube. The other urns were placed at the corners, each having its tube running vertically to the surface of the ground.

"It is evident that when the crypt was built there were deposited in it not only the principal urn containing the calcimined bones and ashes of the deceased, but also the ashes as well, which in time were to contain the ashes of other members of the family. When this time came it was an easy matter to pour the ashes of the deceased through the terra cotta tubes, after they had been taken from the funeral pyres into the urns that awaited them. It is also probable that these tubes served for the libations in honor of the gods.

"The greater part of the tombs were simple in form, but some were enriched with decorations in stucco, figures moulded in bas-relief in the plaster coating by which they were covered. The dimensions of these crypts or cotes varied according to the number of urns they were intended to hold, some being only 75 centimetres in width by $1\frac{1}{2}$ metres in height, which is the usual size of tombs holding one urn.

"It is conjectured that these tombs were grouped according to families or guilds. The earlier searches revealed, for the greater part, the tombs of the *pedesequi*, or footmen, while later on others came to light, such as the *agrimensores*, or land surveyors, in the same excavation. Each class formed a group of crypts separated from one another by a space of only a few inches."

The excavations examined up to this point would seem to indicate that all these tombs were private property. Here is one built by a father or mother in memory of their children:

D. M. S. | CLEMENS. AVG. SF. R. | PIVS VIX. ANNO I. | M. VI.
FECIT OPTATVS | PAT. FILIO. D. S. BM.

D. M. S. | SECVNDVS. AVG. | SF. R. VIXIT ANNIS XVIII.
AELLA FORTV | NATA MATER PIA ME | RENTI FILIO FECIT.

On other epitaphs we find children and grandchildren, brothers, sisters and husbands expressing their love and veneration for the departed. Even companions in bondage did not forget one another in death.

Then again epitaphs were found on the tombs of liberated slaves, of freedmen, of soldiers and even of veterans. It would take up too much space to reproduce these epitaphs in an article like this one, but we may submit some conclusions from them.

As we study these inscriptions we find that the freedmen entombed in this cemetery devoted to slaves belonged to the lower classes of Roman society. The greater part of them would seem to have belonged to the domestic family of the Cæsars and to have been employed in menial occupations. This would seem to indicate that the laws of the empire permitted even slaves to form burial associations.

There is one interesting point for us to notice. The inscriptions in this cemetery would seem to contradict the general opinion that prevails even among historians who have written on ancient slavery. It has been often stated that lawful marriage, the *confugium*, was absolutely forbidden to slaves—that they were only allowed the simple union; in fact, the *contubernium*, and that it was only in exceptional cases that the use of the term *spouse* was accorded them. In the Carthaginian inscriptions we find the terms *conjux*, *uxor* and *maritus* of frequent occurrence, while the term *contubernalis* was found only three times.

This may have been a mitigation of the Roman law made as a compensation to men who had been sent to do service far away from their native land, as many of them seem to have regarded their exile as intolerable. One inscription tells of a husband who expresses his gratitude to his *uxori carissimæ et ob. meritis, quod se secuta essit in provincia Africa*.

Some of these epitaphs not only give us an insight into the occupations of the slave portion of the imperial household, but lead us to ascribe to some of these people a relatively high degree of intellectual culture.

The most important discovery, so far as Christian archæology is concerned and made up to this time by Father Delatre, is to be found in the Christian cemetery at Carthage. To form a proper estimate of the importance of this fact, we must consider what the Christian cemeteries of Rome contributed in the way of art treasures to science, history and even to theology. Near Carthage, as Tertullian tells us, these treasures seem to have been in no way inferior to those of Rome. They appear to have summed up the whole exterior life of the Church. He tells us that the loudest and most bitter cry of the pagans when calling for the destruction of Christians was: "*Areae non sint*" ("no more cemeteries").

So long as Africa remained more or less closed to scientific exploration it was difficult to get a true idea of the primitive *areae*. Their very name would seem to indicate open burial grounds. But the terms used by writers in ancient times were so obscure as to admit of doubt in their interpretation. All that was known with any certainty was that the principal martyrs of Carthage had been buried in an *areae*; that later on basilicas had been built over their tombs, and that Christians longed to be buried near them; but all this was known as well about the Roman catacombs and the details were couched in almost the same language. Moreover, vast catacombs had been discovered near Carthage and at various points in Africa, notably at Cesarea, the capital of the Mauritanias. The question has been asked, Were the *areae* a part of the Carthaginian catacombs or were they mere open burial places like the slave cemetery? If they were, how could the persecuted Christians come together? How could they celebrate the Holy Sacrifice in the tombs of the martyrs? If they were simply burial places, there would have been no reason for their persecutors to follow them with such persistent rage, for ordinary hatred halts in the face of death.

Father Delatre set out to find an answer to these questions, and he found it in the cemetery at Cesarea, in the *area martyrum* or *muro cincta*. It was enclosed within walls high enough to hide the interior from public view, and there was but one gate through which the faithful entered. This arrangement did not differ from that adopted in different parts of Africa by pagan burial societies. In the centre of this cemetery stood a building, the *schola*, in which these societies held their meetings and banquets and collected the dues for the burial of the poor. The *area muro cincta* was not likely, therefore, to attract the attention of the pagans, and it left

the faithful free to meet, as this was a legal privilege allowed to "funeral societies."

The *area hortus*, or first enclosure, kept out the profane, while the *area martyrum*, or *muro cincta*, sometimes called the *Casa Major*, concealed the Christians from hostile view and, as its name indicates, served as a sanctuary, because it was over the very tomb of the martyr that the Holy Sacrifice was celebrated. For this reason, too, this tomb was placed under a sort of dome, beneath which were places for the celebrant and his ministers. The faithful stood around the *mensa*, which was in the centre of the *area*. By standing during the services a much larger number of the faithful could be accommodated in so small a space. It was here that they listened to exhortations that were to prepare them for martyrdom. The fact that these cemeteries were used as places of worship will account for the bitter hostility of the pagans against cemeteries and for their cry: "*Areae non sint!*"

The cemetery at Carthage, as we have already said, was discovered on the west side of the land surrounded by ancient Punic and Roman fortifications running north to the village of Malga and to the very heights overlooking the sea. The acts of the martyrdom of St. Cyprian indicate the "burial of this holy Bishop" as being near the Piscinas, on the road of the Mappelas or Magalas," which would bring it near the village of Malga. Other "acts," equally authentic, show that another cemetery existed in this place near the tomb of St. Cyprian. They are the acts of St. Maximilian, put to death at Thevestu in the year 295. It is said that a Roman matron rescued the body of this holy martyr and had it transported to Carthage on her own litter and buried near St. Cyprian. It is likewise claimed that she was buried here also.

Cardinal Lavigerie assures us that these indications have all been sacrificed in a most striking manner by Father Delatre. In less than two years this zealous priest unearthed, within the space designated by the Cardinal, 1,493 fragments of Christian epitaphs, 227 of which had the words *Fidelis in pace*, 14 had the Dove, 27 the Palm, 5 the Cross, many others the monogram of Christ, whilst others had the very ancient symbols, the Anchor and the Urn.

It is a remarkable fact that all the slabs or stones bearing these inscriptions were broken into such small pieces that it was with the greatest difficulty that they could be put together and deciphered. This circumstance fully confirms what Tertullian tells us about the destruction of Christian cemeteries in Carthage at the hands of the pagans in the second and third centuries and by the Arian vandals in the fifth. The Arabs, in their fanaticism, spared

nothing that would indicate that Christianity had ever gained a foothold in Carthage.

But what will interest us much more than inscriptions is the variety of pagan and Christian lamps, with their symbolism, found in these cemeteries. These lamps, moulded in clay, are very much, in size, shape and designs, like those the writer of this article has seen in the catacombs of St. Calixtus, in Rome. This would lead us to believe that they are of Roman origin. They seem to have been cast in a double mould—one part for the upper half of the lamp and the other for the lower half. A hole, through which the oil was poured, was made later on. We have seen quite a number of these terra cotta moulds in the Museum of Christian Art, in the Louvre, in Paris, and in the Archæological Museum of Marseilles.

Among the specimens of Roman pottery found in Carthage, some are covered with a bright black varnish, all equally fine and well preserved. Christian lamps are mostly unvarnished. Pagan lamps are generally of a grayish clay, while those of the Christians have a red or yellow tint. In the Pagan lamps the shape is more elaborately worked out and the clay is oftener of a finer quality, while those of the Christians are more simple in form and workmanship, but the symbol is always more prominent.

The use of lamps was common to both Christians and Pagans. They were used for lighting the homes of the living as well as of the dead. It was customary to place them in candelabra or other supports of wood or metal.¹ In some places little niches were cut in the inner walls of the house to hold lamps, and, finally, lamps were also placed on the tombs of Christians as well as upon those of Pagans.

At Byrsa two lamps were found, one Christian and one Pagan, both of which contained a piece of money. A learned archæologist (M. Beulé) was not slow in arriving at this conclusion: "It seems to have been the custom in Carthage to drop Charon's toll into the funeral lamp, and this custom was not eradicated by Christianity," but Father Delatre says he found no coins in any of the lamps that came into his hands.

Lamps being used in burial places and for domestic purposes, they were, no doubt, often used in public celebrations. So long as the Church was persecuted, it is true that the Christians refrained from illuminating the exterior of their dwellings, as this custom had an idolatrous signification. Tertullian, it will be remembered, urged the faithful of Carthage not to decorate their homes with laurel and not to illuminate. But when happier days came to the Church, her children, during the celebration of her solemnities,

¹ See "Dictionaire des Antiquités Chrétiennes," by the Abbe Martigny.

used lamps in decorating her temples. Eusebius describes the splendid illuminations ordered by Constantine during Easter celebrations, and the Christians then delighted in decorating their houses with numerous lights. This custom among the early Christians of Carthage will account for the large number of lamps unearthed in Italy, Gaul and Africa.

It was customary with the Pagans to decorate their lamps with figures of their divinities, mythological scenes and other symbolical emblems. Thus, the Horse personified Carthage, and it was found on lamps as well as on the coins of that Punic city.

The early Christians substituted the emblems of this faith in place of the Pagan figures. Symbols engraved on finger rings and on objects in daily use, such as lamps, etc., were used as *tesseres*, for recognizing one another. Each figure had its peculiar meaning which only the faithful, initiated into the secret, were able to understand. This was the case in places where Christians were wont to assemble, as in the Roman catacombs, whose emblems, held in honor during the first ages of the Church, could be seen and recognized.

The same allegorical emblems were noticeable on the Christian lamps in Carthage. Among these were the Fish, the Eagle, the Phoenix, the Cock, the Peacock, the Dove, the Lion, the Hart, the Hare, the Horse with the Palm branch; the Lamb, with the leaf of the Vine, the Cedar, the Palm Tree, the Vase and the Mosaic Candlestick.

Some of these symbols are expressed in the following lines attributed to St. Damasus, who lived in the twelfth century, but which some critics believe to be anterior to this date:

Spes, via, vita, salus, ratio, sapientia, lumen,
 Judex, porta, gigas, rex, gemma, propheta, sacerdos,
 Messias, Zeboot, Rabbi, sponsus, mediator,
 Virga, columna, manus, petra filius, Emmanuelque,
 Vineâ, pastor, ovis, pax, radix, vitis, oliva,
 Fons, paries, agnus, vitulus, eo, propitiator,
 Verbum, honor, rete, lapis, domus, omnis Christus Jesus.

(Man. de l'Art. Chrétien, p. 164.)

With the triumph of the Church under Constantine came a new phase of emblematic signs. The monogram of Christ appears on monuments and becomes gradually transformed into the Cross pure and simple. Finally, the Christians represented Our Lord Himself crowned with a nimbus, crushing the demon under His feet and piercing him with a lance-like Cross.

The Carthaginian lamps discovered by Father Delatre retain this symbol, and will be described further on. They all came from the ruins of this ancient city, and were the result of researches made under the direction of Cardinal Lavigerie or around the Hill

of Byrsa, the Acropolis of the city, and on the adjacent elevation known as the Hill of Juno. It is here, in fact, that some authorities have fixed the site of the celebrated temple of Astrata, the celestial Juno of the Romans. History tells us that the Pagan temple was converted into a Christian church in the year 319. May not some of Father Delatre's lamps have served in adding lustre to the impressions of the religious ceremonies performed in that Carthaginian sanctuary? At all events, they are authentic evidences of the faith that animated the early Christians in the city of the Cyprians, the Augustines, the Monicas, the Perpetuas and the Felicitas.

A study of the symbols found on the lamps dug up out of the ruins of the old Carthaginian cemeteries will prove of interest and give us an idea of early Christian life in Africa, especially in the fourth and fifth centuries.

THE FISH.—Many lamps found at Carthage bear this symbol as the most prominent subject of their oramentation. It is well known that the *fish* is one of the oldest emblems of the Church. Sometimes it symbolizes Our Lord, sometimes, the faithful. St. Augustine, in his *Civitate Dei*, says: "From the five Greek words *ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ ΥΙΟΣ ΣΩΤΗΡ*, (which signify Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour) if you take the first letter of each word you will have *ΙΧΘΥΣ* or *Fish*, a word which mystically represents the name of *Christ*.

This interpretation is also given by St. Optatus, Bishop of Milevia (lib. 3, adv. Parm). In the same way we see INRI on the Crucifix, meaning Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews. (Jesus Nazarenus, Rex Judeorum), which Pilate caused to be placed on the Cross. (St. John xix., 19.) This kind of acrostic symbolizes the Holy Eucharist. Dom Gueranger, the great abbot of Solesmes, says: "Nothing being more mysterious and superhuman than this food which Christ proclaimed when He said, 'My flesh is meat indeed, and My blood is drink, indeed,' the representation of such a mystery in Christian paintings should be the arcanum by excellence. From the beginning the faithful, when they wished to express it, resorted to the anagram *ichthus*, which included all, but said nothing to profane eyes.² This anagram, composed of the first letters of a formula, expressing the dogma of faith, gave a significative word, in accord with the mystery, and representing the Biblical figures, which had announced it." ("St. Cecilia and Roman Society," p. 231.)

But the *fish* as found on many monuments of the early ages,

² Many of our readers will remember the frequent references made to the Fish in the story of "Quo Vadis."

and on lamps for instance, does not always signify Christ. It often stands for the Faithful. Again we consult Dom Gueranger: "What are the faithful," he asks, "but fishes? Did not Christ say to His apostles, 'I will make you fishers of men?'" Tertullian, by comparison with our Lord, Who is the great and sublime "ichthus," designates the Christians under the graceful diminutive of "little fishes." "Nos pisciculi secundum nostrum Jesum Christum." ("De Baptismo," lib. adversus Quintillam).

This idea is clearly expressed on two lamps found in Carthage. On one of them the *Fish*, the symbol of Christ, is represented in the centre of a disc composed of *pisciculi*. On the other two Doves are joined to the *pisciculi* so as to form a sort of wreath around the divine *Fish*. The significance of the Doves in this arrangement leaves no doubt; it is the same as that of the *pisciculi*.³

On another one of these lamps Tertullian's *pisciculi* accompany a Hart in the act of running; and here again, the two emblems taken together have the same meaning. They represent the souls of the faithful going to drink at the fountain of grace. In other cases the Christians are represented by two little fishes, one on the right, the other on the left of the monogram of Christ.

Thus the Fish, with its anagrammatic signification, becomes a mysterious sign, a sign that enabled the early Christians to recognize each other without being exposed to the ridicule or impiety of the Pagans. (See "Manual of Christian Art," p. 163, also see "Quo Vadis.") The symbols on these lamps may be seen on buildings and monuments of the primitive Church and would seem to form a sort of picture catechism telling of the beautiful faith of our Christian ancestors.

As the Fish appears more frequently on lamps than on other objects during this period, does not this peculiarity seem to tell us that Christ came to bring into the world through His incarnation the true light, according to His own words: "*Ego sum Lux mundi?*"

On the disc of another one of these lamps we find the figure of a *dolphin*. This emblem appears quite often on tombs because this *fish* is represented as the friend of man and because the body of St. Lucian was rescued from the waves and taken to a place of sepulture by a *dolphin*.

It will be remembered that Pope Pius IX. in his allocution to the Pious Federation in 1873 said: "Let us be filled with that faith that never wavers and is so appropriately symbolized by the *Fish*, because even as the fish maintains itself in the midst of troubled

³ One of these lamps has three points on the base, arranged in a triangular form (· · ·), to represent the Trinity.

waters, so the true faith will not be put down by opposition or persecution."

THE LION.—The king of beasts is represented in many lamps. In the Apocalypse Our Lord is spoken of as the "lion of the fold of Juda"—"*Vicit leo de tribu Juda*," and the author of the "Manual of Christian Art" adds: "He is indeed a lion—by royal descent, by indomitable courage and by His glorious resurrection." So also has Christianity frequently represented Him in her early tombs.

The lion often forms a base for candlesticks, especially for such as are used for the Paschal candle. Taken collectively, however, lions have a more general signification; they symbolize the faithful endowed with a divine strength which they acquire through the Blessed Sacrament. St. John Chrysostom expresses the idea when he says: "Let us go forth from the Sacred Banquet like lions breathing forth flames and become terrible as demons." St. Charles Borromeo in the Fourth Provincial Council, over which he presided, prescribed the decoration of church doors with the figures of lions as indicative of the vigilance of the Pontiffs and to inspire awe and respect among the faithful.

THE HART.—In olden times the Hart was believed to possess the gift of immortality. "*Ipse aetatis suae arbiter*," as Tertullian says. It was, indeed, believed that when the Hart experienced the effects of disease it had the faculty of recovering its health and renewing its youth by feeding upon serpents, and in Tertullian's time the superstition was still widespread in Africa and it is probable that Carthaginian Christians adopted it as the symbol of immortality.

According to Manachi, the Hart represents the Christian to whom was given the power to flee from persecution. This is contrary to what was taught by some heretics, and even by Tertullian after he had become imbued with the errors of the Montanists.

But most frequently the Hart represents the catechumen when instructed in the wonders effected by the element water, and he ardently longed after the sacred fountain in which he was to be washed from all stains, and who to describe his ardent longing joyfully borrowed the words of David in Psalm xli., "*Quemadmodum desiderat cervus ad fontes aquarum, ita desiderat anima mea, ad te Deus*." "As the hart panteth after the fountains of water, so my soul paneth after Thee, O my God."

Hence, as Dom Gueranger tells us, the soul is represented as panting after Baptism under the form of a young hart.

This symbol has been found on a lamp unearthed at Oudenia (ancient Uthina) and on quite a number of others, one of which

was found in Carthage. On one of these last the hart is represented as running rapidly and flanked by two *pisciculi*.

The Hart also symbolizes the Christian soul hoping to possess God in the Blessed Sacrament, the life-giving fountain of spiritual life. This explains the hart drinking from a cup or chalice, as represented on one of the lamps. It is impossible not to recognize the Holy Eucharist in this subject. On a lamp found on January 1, 1880, the hart is represented as running, in the centre of a disc formed of hares in the same attitude. Here the two symbols confirm each other. The hart and the hares, because of their timidity and agility, signify the fear the Christian soul feels at the approach of danger that threatens its purity and the promptness with which it must flee from it.

THE HORSE.—In ancient times the horse was the emblem of Carthage. The coins found in the ruins of this Punic city frequently give evidence of this fact. We also find the horse on Roman lamps of Pagan origin.

The Christians made the horse the symbol of victory,⁴ basing this idea on the text of St. Paul, who compares Christian life to a race in the arena, the aim of which is victory: "*Sic currite ut apprehendatis*" (I Cor. ix., 24). On one of the other lamps the horse is represented in the act of running; by his side are palm branches; and the disc upon which he appears is encircled by a garland. The evidently Christian character of this piece of pottery is confirmed by a cross designed on the under part of this lamp not unlike a trade-mark.

THE HARE.—This symbol is quite analogous to the one just referred to, and like it, reminds us of the rapid flight of human life, at the end of which is the reward. "Run," says the apostle, "that you may gain the victory." It is this act that the hare is represented on one of these lamps. The same symbol has been noticed on lamps found at Lyons and at Girgenti, in Sicily. Among those found by Father Delatre at Carthage there is one on which the emblem of the Resurrection is placed beside the one representing the shortness of life. A disc formed of running hares encircles, in its centre, the figure of a Cock.

The hare may also be regarded as the expression of Christian vigilance, and especially of the timidity of souls that would preserve their purity. It is also in this sense that in the Middle Ages they sometimes painted the hart on the arm of personified Charity. The magnificent tomb of St. Augustine in the Cathedral of Pavia is a striking example of this.

Whatever may be said of this emblem and its various interpreta-

⁴ See also Job xxxix., 23.

tions, it is certain that the early Christians attached to it some mysterious but well determined meaning or they would not have represented it on their tombs, lamps, etc.

THE LAMB.—“The symbol, par excellence, of Our Divine Saviour,” says the “Manual of Christian Art,” is the Lamb. The Paschal Lamb was His emblem. Isaias compares Him to a lamb (xvi., 7). St. John the Baptist designates Him by that name; the Apocalypse speaks of the “throne of the Lamb” (xiii., 8) and the Christian invokes Him as the “Lamb of God.”

The lamb was the Crucifix of the faithful during the first ages of Christianity so troubled by persecution. In adopting this symbol the Church desired, above all, to convey the victim idea—the Lamb immolated for the redemption of the world. Also as soon as circumstances permitted it, this emblem of sacrifice found a place on Christian monuments, tombs, etc. At first it was associated with the various transformations of the monogram *xt.*, until finally it appeared on the cross itself in the place occupied later on by the hands and feet of the Saviour. Thus it is that we see the Lamb repeated several times and occupying the place of the Latin cross in the background of Byzantine plate and on the disc of one of the Carthaginian lamps. These specimens of pottery date from the sixth century.

The Incarnate Word being represented by this sign, it must possess to a certain degree the character of the lamb. “I send you forth,” says our Redeemer, “as lambs among wolves.” In the parable of the Good Shepherd He continually speaks of the faithful as His sheep that He knows and that know Him. He commands Peter to “feed His sheep,” “His lambs.” The early Christians were careful not to lose sight of this touching comparison, so that wherever lambs appeared in pictures near the figure of Christ, they symbolized the faithful.

Two lambs in Carthage have representations of the Good Shepherd. One in bas-relief is now in the museum at Algiers, the other is a leaden urn which figured at the Paris Exposition of 1867 and attracted great attention.

THE LAMB AND THE VINE.—An earthen lamp found at Oudenia (ancient Uthina) has this symbol in the centre of a disc. We have already studied the *Fish* as a Eucharist emblem, and this symbol would seem to have the same signification. It is not difficult to recognize that the leaf of the vine, placed as it is beside the Lamb, has a clearly dogmatic meaning. It is the application of the words, “My flesh is meat, indeed, and My blood is drink, indeed.” The Divine Lamb is immolated daily upon the altar and the Flesh becomes the meat of the faithful. The wine symbolized by the

vine becomes changed into the blood of our Divine Redeemer and becomes our drink.

A further study of this lamp might lead us to consider the lamb or the sheep as the soul longing to feed upon this "Meat" and to unite itself with God. Then again we see it referred to in the Canticles—"My beloved is a grape in the vine."

The idea of the soul seeking its nourishment in the Eucharistic wine is forcibly illustrated on a figment of marble found in Carthage. A holy personage plucks with avidity a grape from a vine towards which he approaches. The expression of this subject appears to be as Christian as the vine in the frescoes in the Roman Catacombs.

THE CEDAR.—Trees have often been chosen as Christian emblems for monuments, tombs, etc., from the earliest times. St. Fulgencius in one of his sermons says that we are trees planted in the field of the Lord, the Divine Agriculturist, and that we should not remain barren and useless.

The cedar and the cypress, which are looked upon as incorruptible, symbolized the just man in the primitive Church. Wisdom itself is likened in the Holy Scriptures unto a "cedar of Libanus and a cypress tree on Mount Zion" (Eccl. xxiv., 17), and David (Ps. xci., 13) uses the cedar to typify the works of the just. On one of his lamps Father Delatre recognized a tree which he thinks must be a cedar or a cypress, as both have the same meaning in Christian iconography. The symbol on this lamp represents the Christian soul, strong in faith and pure in life, maintaining its purity amid the corruptions of the world.

THE PALM TREE putting forth its branches horizontally, as shown on these lamps, is a figure of the Cross. In the early ages the Cross was simply a tree, the sight of which recalled Him Who was the means of the redemption of the world. All the ancient fathers and all the linguists of the East and West join in rejoicing that heaven chose wood as a means to repair the harm done to humanity through wood.⁵ (See "St. Cecilia and Roman Society," p. 229.)

Ecclesiasticus, after likening Wisdom to the cedar and the cypress, personifies it in the palm tree: *Quasi palma exaltata sum in Cades*. David salutes the just man under the figure of the cedar and the palm: "*Justus est palma florebit sicut cedrus Libani multiplicatur.*"⁵ (Ps. xci., 13.) St. Thomas makes it the emblem of the apostles when he says that this tree symbolizes by its height their exaltation in the Church and by the ideas of victory it suggests—their triumph over persecution and idolatry. ("Dict. of Christian Antiquities"—Art., Apostles.)

⁵ The tree of the forbidden fruit.

In the "Manual of Christian Art" (p. 202) the palm tree is made the symbol of the Good Shepherd. It is found, in fact, thus represented on a leaden vase, to which reference has already been made. This vase must have been a portable holy water font. The same combination of subjects appears on a sarcophagus found at Collo. On Father Delatre's lamp the palm tree stands alone and spreads out its branches as if to embrace the world. It is the symbol of the Tree of Redemption—the Cross.

THE DOVE.—At the baptism of Our Blessed Lord the Holy Ghost appeared in the form of a Dove. "*Jesu baptisato*," says St. Luke (iii., 22), "*apertum est coelum et descendit Spiritus Sanctis corporali specie sicut columba in ipsum.*"

From this we see that in the most remote Christian times the custom of representing the Dove on monuments, etc., to designate the third person of the Blessed Trinity was not uncommon. The "Memorial of Christian Art" declares that the Dove is the only emblem that can properly convey an idea of the Holy Ghost by means of a visible, living, animated figure, one that responds to the character of the sacred Person, at least in so far as we can conceive and express it.

Tertullian teaches that the Holy Ghost, in coming down from heaven upon Our Lord in the form of a Dove, manifested His nature by the figure of a creature eminently simple and innocent and whose body is without bitterness or hatred: "*Columbae figura delapsus in Dominum, ut natura Spiritus Sancti declararetur per animal simplicitatis et innocentiae; quod etiam corporalitur ipso felle caret columbe.*" ("De Baptismo," c. viii.)

St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage (A. D. 249), expresses the same thought in these words: "The Holy Ghost appears in the form of a Dove, an animal simple and blithe and without bitterness." In the third century there was a notion prevalent that gall, that bilious vesicle common to all animals, was absent in the body of the dove.

This zoölogical error does not in any way detract from the value and the beauty of the symbol. Has not Our Lord exhorted us to imitate the simplicity of the Dove?

On the disc of one of the lamps the Dove appears close to the Lion as a symbol of the union of gentleness with strength. But it most frequently happens that a number of doves flocked together form a sort of divine following to the *Fish*; sometimes they appear with the Cross. They symbolize the souls that seek their only happiness in Christ.

Two lamps were found on which was a bird resembling a hen more than a dove. The disc of each of these lamps is formed of

little birds or chickens. May not this be a figure of Our Lord, Who compares Himself to a "hen gathering her chickens under her wing?" (Matt. xxii., 37.)

On counting the number of rows of these little chickens the disc was unfortunately broken; it was finally ascertained to be twelve. This might be translated to represent the apostles under the tutelage of their Divine Master.

We might also recognize in it the Church watching over the souls of the faithful with all the maternal solicitude with which a hen watches over her little ones with all her wonderful instinct of affection. This interpretation, however, is hazarded, as we find no work on iconography giving the hen as a symbol of Our Blessed Lord.

THE COCK.—The old pagans made the cock the emblem of vigilance, and it was sacrificed to Esculapius. The early Christians adopted it not only as the emblem of vigilance, but of Faith, Hope and Resurrection. St. Ambrose's hymn, "*Æterne verum conditor*," fully expresses all the thoughts that could be awakened in the Christian soul by the figure of the cock:

Surgamus ergo strenue,
Gallus jacentes excitat
Et somnolentes, increpat
Gallus negantes arguit.
Gallo canente spes redit,
Agris salus refunditur,
Mucro latronis conditur,
Lapsis fides revertitur.

But the presence of the cock on the tombs of the first centuries was intended to remind Christians of their faith in the Resurrection. This idea is strongly accentuated on one of the lamps, on which the cock is represented in the centre of a disc encircled by running hares, symbolizing the rapid passing away of this life.

On a piece of pottery of red clay, somewhat resembling our lamps, the cock is represented with his head decorated with palm—the symbol of victory. Cock-fighting having been a favorite sport with the ancients, the cock decorated with the palm branch must have symbolized the Christians' triumph over the snares of the devil.

THE PEACOCK.—This bird, according to the old pagans, was dedicated to Juno, who had a magnificent temple at Carthage. On the early tombs of the Christian era the peacock was the emblem of the immutability of the soul and of eternal happiness. St. Augustine, in his "*Civitate Dei*," also regards the peacock as the emblem of immortality, because even in his day the flesh of the bird was considered incorruptible. But it is chiefly as an emblem of the Resurrection that the faithful have used it on their tombs. St.

Anthony of Padua compares our risen bodies to the peacock, which sheds its feathers every year only to reproduce new ones.

On two lamps cast from the same mould the peacock is represented with one of its little ones on its back. The disc on which it appears is decorated with palms, cypresses and doves. This subject is nearly reproduced in a painting in a Christian catacomb at Milan, and is described in the "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities."

THE PHŒNIX.—The figure of this fabulous bird seems to have been recognized on one of the lamps found at Carthage. This bird is described by the pagans as a native of Arabia. It is believed to exist single in the world, to burn itself at the end of 500 years and to revive from its own ashes.

We read in the "Acts of the Martyrs" about Valerian and Tiburtius, that when the latter wished to convert Maximilian (an officer who was to accompany him to the place of execution) he said to him: "My body will be reduced to ashes, only to rise again like the phœnix to the light that is to shine forever." And after the officer had followed the martyrs to their victory, Cecilia, the spouse of Valerian, had the precious remains placed in a tomb, on which, by her order, was carved a phœnix, in remembrance, no doubt, of the words spoken by Tiburtius, and by which he sought to convey to Maximilian an idea of the Resurrection. ("St. Cecilia and Roman Society," p. 305.)

THE EAGLE, the king of birds, according to the old pagans, was dedicated to Jupiter. It was to the Roman legions what the horse was to the Carthaginian armies—the sign of victory.

If we would learn the Christian signification of the Eagle on the lamps, we must consult the Sacred Scriptures. Moses, in his magnificent canticle (Deut. xxxii., 11) compares God to the Eagle in these words: "As the eagle enticing her young to fly, God hath spread His wings over Jacob, and taken him and carried him on His shoulders."

It is assumed by some authorities that not a few of the Fathers of the Church, basing themselves on Psalm cii., 5, *renovatum aquila juventus tua*, words that refer to the periodical moulting of the eagle, regard it as the symbol of the Resurrection.

This emblem may also be taken as a sign of Hope, according to the words of Isaias: "*Qui sperant in Domino . . . assument penmas sicut aquilla.*"

Tertullian in illustrating that there are things invisible to man and visible to spirits, says: "Nocturnal birds cannot look at the sun with their eyes, while the eagle can look at it steadily. The strength of their little ones is estimated by the power of their eyes,

and those are considered unfit to live that turn their gaze from the brilliant orb of day." ("Liber de Anima," cap. vii.)

THE MOSAIC CANDLESTICK.—Antiquarians do not agree in interpreting the origin of the Candlestick, found on the tombs of the first centuries of our era. The learned Bossio and not a few others, speaking of lamps found in the Roman Catacombs, attaches a Christian meaning to them, while archæologists of our day hold a contrary opinion, alleging that the candlestick has never been seen on mural paintings in the Catacombs nor on tombs known to be undoubtedly Christian. Father Delatre, however, has found a lamp in Carthage which he would not have classed among Christian lamps were it not that it bears this inscription:

VICTORINVS
 CESQVE IN PACE
 ET IRENEV.

and under it are sculptured the candlestick and the palm. The words IN PACE and the palm are according to all archæologists essentially Christian symbols, while the candlestick, associated with it, must partake of the same meaning. The lamp bearing this figure and found among the ruins of the same city in which other Christian lamps were found surely warrant its being classed among Christian lamps.

Gio. Pietro Bettori, in 1691, also refers to a Roman lamp bearing the Mosaic candlestick, and he attributes a Jewish origin and meaning to this emblem. Other authorities give the Mosaic candlestick a Christian signification, and this opinion is based in olden times on other proofs besides this inscription, and archæologists will, no doubt, come to agree with Bossio, whose opinion is further confirmed by texts from St. Gregory the Great, the Venerable Bede, St. Jerome and Theophilus of Antioch. (Dic. Christian Architecture; art., Candelabra.)

It is most probable that the emblem of the Mosaic candlestick was known to both Christians and Jews, with a special signification, no doubt, but the origin of either can neither be accepted nor rejected.

THE VASE OR URN has been frequently found painted or otherwise designed on Christian tombs. It appears in Carthage on two mortuary marbles; also, on two lamps in Father Delatre's collection. On one of the marbles the vase appears between two plants, to represent Paradise; the other simply shows the vase without accessories.

The Abbé Martigny says that the vase or urn represents the human body, and the human body in the tomb. It is the teaching of St. Paul, *vasa iræ, apta interitum*. (Rom. ix., 22.) In his soliloquies he asks himself: "*Quid sum?*" and he answers himself, "*Vas*

fatidum." Accentuating the same thought, he says again: "*Quid iterum ego? Vas aptum in contumelium. Quid futurus sum? Vas sterquilinii.*" Tertullian uses this figure: "*Nos vasa festilia.*" Lactantius expresses the same idea in these words: "*Corpus est quasi vasculum, quo tamquam domicilio temporalis spiritus cælestis utatur*" ("Dic. Christ. Antiquities," art., Vase.)

The vases which appear, with the monogram of Christ on lamps recently found, symbolize the elect. Our Lord Himself, in the Acts of the Apostles, calls St. Paul *vas electionis*. See also the use of the word in the Litany of the B. V. M.

THE MONOGRAM OF CHRIST, THE "CHI-RHO."—Many lamps and mortuary marbles bear this monogram, as we often see it in the frescoes and bas-reliefs of the Catacombs and on sarcophagi of the Merovingian period in France. We shall examine the various modifications of this monogram, beginning with one Constantine caused to be traced on his labarum, or imperial standard, and which appeared on many of his coins.

This monogram is formed by the combination of the Greek letters X and P, which are the first two in the word *ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ*, Christ. It was in the time of Constantine that it first appeared on tombs of known dates. This emblem appears on two of Father Delatre's lamps in the clearest form, and is surrounded by a cluster of symbols denoting victory. On two other lamps this sign appears surrounded by twelve flowers, symbolizing the twelve tribes and the twelve Apostles, and also indicating the universality of the people of God. ("Manual of Christian Art," p. 128.) We come across it again in a wreath of cypress or cedars, and in another case it is flanked by two fishes (*pisciculi*), the interpretation of which we have already given.

In the preceding monogram the Cross is concealed under the form of the X, but the freedom accorded the Church under Constantine permitted Christians to make the sign of the Cross more evident. This will, no doubt, account for the changed form of the symbol by substituting a single transverse line for the X.

The adoption of this type seems due to its relation to the Cross on which the Redeemer of the world was immolated. This monogram is called cruciform, or rectilineal, and sometimes the monogrammatic Cross. It has been found on mortuary marbles and on the discs of many clay lamps. On one of them the monogram is flanked by two omegas, and at the base are three points, arranged in triangular form, while on the border of the disc are twelve flowers, the meaning of which is explained above. On another lamp twelve hearts encircle the same monogram, but in this case it is

flanked by two doves, and on each side the series of six hearts terminates with another dove.

"The number *twelve*," says the "Manual of Christian Art," "formed by the number *three* and the number *four*, by multiplication differs from the number *seven*, which is formed by addition, but shares with it the signification of universality. It represents the Twelve Tribes and the twelve Apostles; twelve sheep and twelve doves relate to both of these symbols and proclaim the universality of the people of God." The same may be said of the twelve flowers and the twelve hearts that appear with the monogram and, later on, with the Cross on Christian lamps from the time of the triumph of the Church.

We may attribute to the carelessness of the potter those rectilinear monograms on which the loop of the Greek P is turned to the left instead of to the right, so that the Greek letter, instead of having the form of our capital P, has that of our small q. It is in this style that the monogrammatic Cross is represented on a handsome piece of Byzantine pottery and on specimens of Carthaginian lamps.

Besides the monogram composed of X and P, the first letters of the Greek word *Christos*, there is another, found on ancient tombs and even on some Carthaginian lamps. It is formed of the first letter of the Greek word for *Jesus* and the first letter of the Greek word for *Christ*. The combination of these two Greek letters I and X makes this monogram.

The Christ-sign in its pure form does not appear to a certainty until the time of Constantine, but the one we are going to examine has been recognized on an epitaph, the date of which puts it prior to the reign of that Emperor. The early Christians had, therefore, a monogram by which they symbolized the name of Jesus Christ on their tombs. Would it not appear from this that Father Delatre's lamp antedates the preceding ones? The disc bearing this monogram is embellished with four doves.

THE LATIN CROSS.—After passing through various modifications the Christ-sign was reduced to the plain cross about the beginning of the fifth century. The P disappears and the Latin or Greek cross takes the place of the monograms. Many of the lamps found in Carthage bear this august symbol of our Redemption. On one of these we find the cross in a disc surrounded by a circle formed successively of hearts and spear-points. On another lamp we find flowers and hearts alternating. Here the cross is flanked by hearts; there it stands encircled by doves. In another case the dove is surmounted by a cross to symbolize the Divine Victim offered up

for the redemption of the world. Finally, the cross appears surrounded with medallions, each showing the figure of the Lamb.

According to the learned Rossi, it was Africa, and especially Carthage, that began the designing of the plain cross on its monuments. It has been found on marbles of the fourth century.

But it was only in the fifth century that the true cross began to show itself in the rest of the Church throughout the then Christian world. Moreover, the devotion of the faithful of Carthage and of Africa is made known to us through Tertullian, who as far back as the third century said that the faithful made the sign of the cross on all occasions, even the least important. When St. Augustine describes the Cross of the Passion he always gives the Latin form.

The veneration of the cross by the faithful of Carthage is evidenced on two lamps recently discovered. The cross is represented standing under a sort of niche or portico composed of two columns with capitals connected at the top by an ornamented arch. The border of the disc is made up of symbolical birds.

But the most beautiful cross beyond all doubt is the one formed of several medallions and in which the Lamb is prominent. This is the style of cross that immediately preceded the crucifix as we know it to-day. Up to the sixth century Our Lord had never been represented in person in the cross. The early Christians were content with the figure of the Lamb, the characteristic emblem of the Divine Victim of our redemption.

This Lamb cross is flanked by two hearts and supported by two others. Among the ornaments forming the disc the heart is many times repeated with the monogram of Constantine. This lamp, so far as to the fine quality of the clay and the delicacy of workmanship, is the best specimen of all the lamps found in Carthage. On the bottom of the lamp the trade-mark represents a head in profile, doubtless the portrait of the Christian potter, proud of his work.

THE CROSS FLANKED BY THE ALPHA AND OMEGA:—The fragment of a lamp was found, on which was a cross, the horizontal arms of which are flanked by the Greek letters Alpha and Omega. These signs, it is evident, express an act of faith in the divinity and eternity of Christ. They are taken from the text of the Apocalypse of St. John, in which Our Lord said: "*Ego sum Alpha et Omega, primus et novissimus, principium et finis.*" "The Alpha and Omega by the cross," says the Abbé Martigny, "is the most striking character in tombs in Africa, where it was used in an especial manner as a protest against the Arian heresy, which denied the divinity of Christ.

DANIEL IN THE LION'S DEN.—This subject is often seen in ancient frescoes in the Catacombs and appears on a lamp found in 1872 at the foot of the Byrsa Hill. Daniel is standing with outstretched arms, in the attitude of prayer, with two lions at his feet. Near the prophet are two persons—one representing Habacuc offering a round loaf; the other, seemingly an angel, as if in the act of blessing, extends his hand towards Daniel. Some authors recognize in this angel the one who took Habacuc from Judea to Babylon, that he might minister unto Daniel.

The great abbot of Solesmes, Dom Gueranyer, sees in this picture a type of the martyrdom which the Christians of the early ages were wont to regard as the more or less imminent end of their existence. St. Peter in his first epistle said: "Christ having suffered in the flesh, be you also armed with the same thought" (iv., 1). Martyrdom or apostasy were then the alternatives that might await them from one moment to another. It is for this reason that the representations of the three children in the fiery furnace and that of Daniel in the lion's den are so frequent in the Catacombs. These two subjects have been found on Christian lamps. Up to the present time only the latter representation has been found in Carthage.

But let us follow Dom Gueranyer in his development of this thought:

"The quiet courage with which the Prophet Daniel met these ferocious beasts should be that of the Christian when called upon to enter the arena to be, in his turn, devoured by the lions; and if at any time it should please God to give a lesson to pagans by restraining these beasts and causing them to stand still and tamely at the feet of these athletes of the faith, the Christian must not presume upon the privilege, but hold himself ever ready to feel the teeth of the hungry wild beasts sink into their flesh and devour their bodies." ("St. Cecilia and Roman Society," p. 242.)

It was then the idea of the potter to keep the Christian in mind of possible martyrdom and perhaps of the help of God in appeasing the fury of the lions in behalf of His saints.

This type of lamps cannot be attributed to a period prior to the fifth century, as the design is absolutely missing in the moulds used before that time to represent Daniel in the den of lions.

In admitting this date we can understand how the trials the African church was then undergoing again evoked this subject to revive, as it has done in former ages, the idea of martyrdom in the minds of the faithful, because the Arian persecution was then pursuing the Christians with Satanic malignity.

OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.—The best preserved and the most

interesting of all the lamps discovered among the ruins of Carthage is the one to which we now refer. The subject it represents is no longer a symbol; it is no longer the Name of Christ concealed under emblems of different monograms; nor is it even the cross, pure and simple, whether Greek or Latin, but our Blessed Lord Himself, standing with His head crowned by an aureola, vested in a tunic, trampling under foot the infernal serpent and crushing its head with a long spear surmounted by a cross.

A lamp almost similar to this one was discovered in 1866 in Rome among the ruins of the palace of the Cæsars. Another such lamp was discovered in the Diocese of Constantine, and is fully described by M. Herion de Villeforse in his pamphlet, entitled "*Lampes Chrétiennes Inédites*" (1876).

The large number of Christian lamps found in Carthage prove the great anxiety of the faithful in the early ages to reproduce and spread abroad the symbols of their faith in Our Blessed Lord.

The Metropolitan church of Africa, illustrious for its Bishops and its numerous martyrs no less than for its glorious councils, sees at last, after twelve centuries of oblivion, the cross rising once more over its heaping ruins. The same Sacred Victim that was long ago offered up upon the altars of the twenty-two basilicas of Carthage returns after all these centuries to dwell once more in the land of the Perpetuas, the Felicitas, the Cyprians, the Monicas, the Augustines and the St. Louis. The vault of the chapel built in honor of France's sainted King resounds with the same *Credo* that the Christians of ancient Carthage and of all Northern Africa were wont to sing. It is a faithful echo of the first ages of the Church. The cross, the symbol of peace and civilization, so long hidden under ruins, shines forth and soars once more over a land teeming with Catholic memories. It is the triumph of Christ as He is represented on the richest of these lamps—a beautiful expression of that liturgic chant that never grows old: *Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat.*

MARC F. VALLETTE.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

OUTLINES OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE MYSTICAL LIFE.

DESCRIPTION OF THE MYSTICAL LIFE.

MYSTICAL LIFE IS LIFE WITH GOD.

IN THE words of Bishop Waffelaert, of Bruges, in his opusculé, "*La Mystique et la Perfection Chrétienne*," mystical life is a life of intimate, sustained, conscious union with God.

It is the life of a loving soul with the loving God. A wholly supernatural kind of life, spiritual, interior, secret, hidden to the eyes of men, hence its name of mystical, which means something hidden. A most unfortunate confusion has been made in comparatively recent times on the meaning of mystical life. There is the school of the wide definition, which by mystical life understands, purely and simply, the life of active, conscious union of a soul with God, in the secret of the heart, as here described. Then there is the school of the narrow definition, which by mystical life understands one of extraordinary miraculous favors from God to a soul, such as visions, revelations, raptures, the gift of prophecy, of miracles. This last meaning is quite wrong. The wider meaning is the traditional one, the only one in possession for more than fifteen centuries, in fact, up to the time of St. John of the Cross and St. Francis of Sales, and really the only legitimate and rational one.

The Psalmist says: "It is good for me to cling to God." (Psalms lxxii., 28.) Now mystical life is that—actually and perseveringly clinging to God, finding in Him one's delight, making this the one supreme and sole business on earth, the *Unum necessarium*.

It is not a one-sided affair, an affair in which man alone is concerned and does it all. No. Two are actively engaged together in the mystical life, namely, these two—the loving soul and the loving God, and God even more than the soul, for God it is who begins by exciting the soul to seek Him and who raises her above her natural weakness, sustaining her throughout, and who rewards her puny efforts with the magnificent gift of Himself; whilst on her own part the loving soul answers with alacrity the call of God, faithfully coöperates with the lights and motions of His grace and yields herself wholly up to His divine embraces.

Mystical life, then, we may as well call at once life with a partner (*la vie a deux*), as is married life. With this difference, that in human marriage the partner is another human being, whilst in mystical life, a wonder! The partner is God. And with this

further difference, that human marriage is principally a consortium of the bodies: "They two shall be in one flesh" (Mark x., 8), whilst mystical life is principally a consortium of spirit. "God is a spirit" (John iv., 5,) and "He that clings to God is one spirit." (1 Cor.) The flesh comes into it only to be made also one with the spirit, to be first crushed and then raised above herself, made in a way spiritual. To the mystic God is all in all, and the rest of things do not count, except in relation with God. The mystic lives in the conscious presence of God, in the willed and loved company of God, in a sweet familiarity with God, in the enjoyment of God. There is a constant exchange of love between God and that soul, as between husband and wife or bride and bridegroom, as set forth in the *Canticle of Canticles*. Only all that is purely spiritual of course; and it is hidden in the secret of the loving heart, jealously shielded from the profane gaze of creatures, for "it is good to keep the secret of the King." (Tob. xii., 7.)

Mystical life, when it comes after a life of tepidity, inaugurates a new order of relations between God and man, new and very special relations, more intimate, more loving, more sweet, more delicate and tender, both on the part of God and on the part of that man, that order of relations predicted in Osee: "I will espouse thee to Me forever; and I will espouse thee to Me in justice and judgment and in mercy and in commiseration. And I will espouse thee to Me in faith, and thou shalt know that I am the Lord." (Os. ii., 19.) It was not so before, and it is not so with the non-mystic. It is indeed a new state of affairs, but it is the right one, the one that should have prevailed from the beginning, the one that should always prevail. Mystical life is simply the holy life as God has planned it for us as a temporary substitute of the bliss of heaven and a prelude to it, a life in which all the resources brought by sanctifying grace are fully worked out, where the sacraments are made to yield all their fruits and the presence of the Holy Ghost in the soul, with His seven gifts, is given all its efficacy.

Mystical life is the normal Christian life, the full Christian life, Christian life as it should be lived by all and everywhere and under all circumstances, whilst the Christian life as it is lived, alas, by the immense majority of people is simply abnormal and monstrous, shorn of its bearings upon all the details of life and deprived of its efficacy and of most of its precious fruits. Mystical life is a human life made supernatural and wholly divine in all its manifestations, even the most lowly and material ones, such as eating, going to sleep, recreation, material work, "whether you eat or drink, or whatever else you do, do all to the glory of God." (1

Cor. x., 31.) The mystic becomes deiform, not only in the substance of his soul, as is the case with every man in the state of grace, but also in all his activities. There, the divine ideal, nay, God Himself, has impregnated and transformed everything. "I live, says St. Paul, now not I, but Christ liveth in me." (Gal xl., 20.) God lives in the mystic, reverberates his divine life in the mystic, and the mystic in his turn lives in God. "Your life," says St. Paul, "is hidden away with Christ in God." (Col. iii., 3.) From the very start the mystic, in order to find God, is led to retire into himself, which act is called *introversion*, and once he has there found Him whom his soul loveth, for "the kingdom of God is within you" (Luke xvii., 21), the mystic delightfully loses himself in God and would fain never want to come out again and live with the outer world of creatures. Even when compelled to, again, have converse with the world and attend to exterior occupations, the best part of him is away from it all, secretly clinging to God and making love to Him and enjoying Him.

The mystic, without neglecting any of his external duties, simply lives with God, simply lives upon God, feasts upon God, finds in God his all in all. To the mystic God is (as he is indeed) the great reality, the only one worthy to engross perpetually his attention and win and retain for evermore the affections of his heart. He joys in the thought of the presence of God, of the goodness of God, of his sanctity, of his divine life and infinite bliss and infinite loveliness. He is never tired of speaking to God of his love for Him and of laying himself out open to his utmost capacity to the divine influences. And God on His part does not stay behindhand with His servant; He lays hand on all the faculties of the mystic and makes His divine presence felt to him. He floods his mind with wonderful illuminations and his will with marvelous infusions of strength, and at times (though not all the time) God fills the heart of His servant with ineffable sweetness, whilst at other times God tries him with dryness of spirit and the withdrawal of heavenly consolation. But this never discourages the faithful servant. He knows God is always there, invisibly holding him and steering his soul safely through the dense fog and among breakers, as a skillful pilot does the ship which a self-diffident captain has surrendered into his hands.

Now it is this wonderful life with God as a partner which we call the mystical life. Shall we say that it is a very extraordinary sort of life? If by extraordinary we mean that it is seldom met with, yes, alas, so it is. But if we mean an impracticable, a well nigh impossible life, one meant only for a very few chosen souls, we are in error. No, mystical life is not impracticable or well nigh

impossible, nor is it only for a few. It is simply the very perfection of Christian life, to which we are all called, and which we shall be, mayhap, severely punished in Purgatory for not having attained. Mystical life appears to us extraordinary and well nigh impossible only because we are men of little faith and we have allowed our charity to grow cold. Mystic life is the right kind of life; any other is wrong.

WHO ARE MYSTICS AND WHO ARE NOT.

Evidently non-mystics are all those in the state of mortal sin. Far from living with God, they live with His enemy, the devil. They have given themselves over to him; they belong to him; he is with them and in them. Yes, in them; they are his dwelling. Read St. Luke ix., 24-26. A terrible state of affairs indeed. Non-mystics also are all those tepid and negligent Christians who though not habitually in a state of sin, and therefore not living with the devil, cannot, however, be said to live with God, but rather with self and the world of creatures. Though in a state of grace, they do not do the actions of grace, but those of a purely natural life. The Holy Ghost in them is not allowed to have His own way; they hold Him, so to say, bound hand and foot and gagged; they offer Him that indignity. They have not faith enough to believe that God can make them happy; they prefer to try creatures, and though these invariably fail them, they are content to renew the experiment any number of times. No intimate intercourse between them and God: they never have anything to say to Him from their heart; they take no notice of His presence. They treat Him as a stranger. "Behold," says Our Lord, "I stand at the gate and knock" (Apoc. xx.), but they turn a deaf ear to Him, and withal they are perfectly satisfied with themselves. A very sad state of affairs, this, and how dangerous. Read what Our Lord says of it in the Apoc. xiv., 20.

Non-mystics also, but quite innocently, are the little children who, though baptized, and therefore in a state of grace and fit for the immediate possession of Heaven, should they happen to die, are nevertheless incapable of the union with God by active love which requires discernment of the understanding and the full play of our queen faculty, the will. Many think themselves mystics and qualified to talk or to write about the mystical life who are hardly in it or even not at all, and who do not so much as suspect what it really means. On the other hand, many lead the mystical life unawares, and are sometimes very far advanced in it without suspecting that God is doing great things in them or realizing that this is the

mystical life. I have found such in all the walks of life, notably among the poor and little children and very illiterate persons, even among the savage tribes of North America.

There are also the false Mystics, tools of the devil, who would mislead even the true children of God if these were not on their guard. Their errors generally run into formal heresies and they are easily known by their contempt of the Church's teaching and authority. Such were the Gnostics of early Christianity, many sects of the middle ages, in modern times, Molinos, Madame Guyon and others, and the modernists of our own day. There are those who make mystical life to consist in visions and revelations and all sorts of extraordinary things. If truly humble, then, they will be led naturally to wish to have nothing whatever to do with mystical life. But if silly and vain, they may covet the glory of these things, and not being able to lay hands on the real gifts of God, they may get up to themselves a trumpery article, work themselves into self-induced counterfeit ecstasies, auto suggestions of revelations; nay, they may lay themselves open to the grossest deceptions of the evil one. Bishops, priests, as well as superiors of religious communities have to be on their guard against religious cranks, cheats, holy Willies, self-deluded and hallucinated people and to handle roughly and nip in the bud any breaking out of the visionary spirit. For it is those things which have brought the very name of mystics into ill repute. How unjustly, it is easy enough to see, when one considers the true nature of the mystical life as set forth in the preceding chapter.

The true mystic does not wish for visions and revelations and extraordinary states of body or mind; and if they are vouchsafed him, he fears them and would fain put them aside, knowing that they do not constitute sanctity and are not without danger. He wishes to pass unnoticed. He is most simple and unaffected, most humble and obedient. Outwardly he does just the same things that other men do in his profession and surroundings. His glory is within. "All the glory of the king's daughter is from within." There are in the whole range of Christian life privileged situations, where it is more easy and at the same time more imperative to lead the mystical life, by reason of the sacredness of the functions one has to exercise and of the abundance of graces one receives in them. Such are the clerical state, the religious state, also the state of virginity or widowhood in the world, when persons resolve to give themselves wholly to God, though unable for some reason to enter religion. This notwithstanding, it remains absolutely true that mystical life, even in its fullness and perfection, is without need of a special vocation, also for all men, of whatever age, pro-

essions and conditions of life, as is abundantly proved by the history of the Church and the annals of sanctity.

In order to begin to live the mystical life only two things are required: First, the state of grace; second, a little love or good will. Good will enough to seek after God, to pay attention to God, to listen to Him, to talk lovingly to Him. Nothing more is required—neither science, nor any sort of talent, nor even acquired virtue. The sinner fresh from a life of sin can begin at once and indeed should, as David when he repented of his great crime and gave vent to his feelings in the seven penitential psalms, as Magdalen when she dared to cover with the kisses of her polluted lips the feet of the most Holy One, bathing them with her tears and drying them with her disheveled hair; as the celebrated penitents of all ages. Even the good thief on his cross by the side of the dying Saviour lived one or two hours of the intensest and most genuine mystical life. In fact, there on Calvary, we find all classes of mystics represented or the whole gamut of the mystical life, thus: first, the most Holy One, the pattern of all mystics, Jesus and Him crucified; next, His immaculate virgin mother, addolorata, the Mystical Rose; then St. John, the virgin apostle, the beloved, the spoiled child, so to say, of divine love; close to him, Magdalen, the sinful woman, to whom much had been forgiven, because she had loved much; and finally the good thief, who was, that very day, from his gibbet of infamy to step into Paradise.

THE LAW OF PROGRESS IN THE MYSTIC LIFE.

Nota.—The doctrine of this chapter is set forth against negligent and tepid souls who do not care to make any progress and against Quietists who aim at establishing themselves in a state where there would be no striving after better things, and against those Protestants who contend that faith alone is necessary without any good works, and finally against some souls of good will who allow themselves to be kept stationary either through faint-heartedness or out of a false conception of the nature and exigences of the mystic life.

In the first chapter of these Outlines we have been at some pains to describe the Mystic life in its fullness and perfection. But one cannot expect to arrive at that perfection at the outset, no more than one can reach the top of a mountain at a single jump, or grow from childhood to the full stature of a man in a day, or raise a crop in the same instant that one does the planting or the sowing; no more than one expects to see a bird fly before it has grown wings or a babe at the breast do a man's work.

It is true, as theologians assure us, that by one single act of

theirs in coöperation with the grace of God the blessed angels were at once saved and consummated in sanctity, so that one moment saw them on the way and the next moment arrived at the goal. But things do not proceed in the same way with us men. Our nature, inferior to that of pure spirits, has a mode of action less perfect, so that our trial is lengthened out into a period of time.

Moreover, the present conditions of our striving after the perfection of sanctity are altered from what they were at first; for Adam and Eve innocent; we are now in the condition of probation under sin, that is, with the consequences of original sin on our individual self, and in the midst of a world of sin, in the midst of hosts of enemies visible and invisible, all which tend to make our progress more difficult and would make it impossible were it not but that "where sin abounded grace does more abound" (Rom. v., 20.)

It is therefore only by an immense multitude of successive and varied and more or less difficult acts that we shall develop in ourselves the latent aptitudes to sanctity which the grace of God through the sacraments has deposited in us, and that we shall grow to our full stature of the perfect man in Christ Jesus, and that we shall yield all the fruits that God has a right to expect of us; in a word, that we shall come to the perfection of the mystic life. Nay, even after having if we be so happy, attained to that very perfection (as we shall further describe it) it will rest with us to increase it indefinitely until the very moment of our death. For, what is marvelous in the growth of the spiritual man, is the fact that whereas we cannot add a cubit, no, not even half an inch, to our bodily stature, there is no limit to the cubits we may add to the stature of our souls. "And," says F. C. Kolbe in the "Art of Life," "this conscious growth in the supernatural is the highest form of human existence." This process of the transformation of our natural man or of the old Adam in us into the new man which is Christ, slow and gradual and painful as it is, is the most marvelous thing, a sight for God and His angels.

Now that is at least one advantage of our present condition, one that could almost make the angels and saints of God in glory jealous of us, this, namely, that we can do and suffer every day and at every hour more for the love of God, gain more merits, enlarge our capacity for loving God, grow in sanctity, ascend higher and higher on the ladder of perfection.

Not only may we do so, but we must do so, we should do so, and if we fail to do it, we are guilty and shall have to answer for it. Every day ought to find us further removed from our wonted vices and imperfections than the day before. Every successive

hour spent in the service of God, every fresh act of piety, such as the celebration of the Divine sacrifice, or assistance at it, or Holy Communion or confession, or prayer; every Pater or Ave or ejaculatory prayer ought not only to make one that much richer in merits, but also at the same time more skillful in the art of serving God and the brethren, in the art of overcoming self and vanquishing the devil, especially in the art of prayer and contemplation.

John Ruskin, the great art critic, says that a true painter never makes a new picture but that it is better than the one he painted before, because each time he sets to his work and gives his whole heart and soul to it, he becomes more master of his tools and materials and of his own faculties. Only the negligent or the abject-minded who looks on his noble art but as a means of making money will content himself to multiply pictures without any change for the better, without gaining any more skill in the art; nay, he will even deteriorate and grow incapable. It is very much the same in spiritual life with those half-hearted Christians who are content to go through the same exercises of piety thousands of times, mechanically, without stirring themselves to a greater love of God. Not only do they not advance, but they will surely deteriorate and perhaps even come to give it all up, as they find no consolation in these performances.

We have so-called pious people who say no end of prayers and receive enough sacraments to turn them into seraphs and who advance not a step on their way to perfection. They are satisfied with the fruits to be gained *ex-opere operato*, and do not bestir themselves to produce the fruit *ex-opere operantis*, which should never go separated from the first. They receive the good things of God, but turn them to no account, just as a man who would eat hearty meals, but who would do no work.

That we are not at liberty so to behave ourselves, but that we ought ever to progress, to grow in sanctity, to climb up the ladder of virtue and to become more united to God, is shown by innumerable passages of Holy Scripture in both Testaments. Our Lord tells us: "Be ye perfect, even as your Heavenly Father is perfect," thereby opening out before us an infinite race-course, in which we can never say I have reached the goal. Hence the Glossa quoted by St. Thomas 2, 2, 9, 24, a. 7, says: "None of the faithful, however much he may have progressed, say, That is enough."

In saying this he would step out of the road before reaching the end. Hence St. Paul (Phil. iii., 12): "Brethren, I do not count myself to have apprehended, but forgetting the things that are behind, I stretch forth myself to those that are before." And Prov. iv., 18, says: "The path of the just as a shining light goeth forwards

and increaseth even to perfect day." And Psalms lxxxiii., 8: "They shall go from virtue to virtue." Our Lord again commands us (Luke xiii.): "Trade until I return," and in the parable of the talents He shows us the reward and the need of praise bestowed on those good servants who doubled their havings, while he who wrapped his talent in a napkin is rebuked and punished.

Hence also the Council of Trent, (Sess. 6, 10,) speaks thus of increasing our justification after we have once received it: "Therefore such as have thus been justified and made friends of God and servants of the faith are renewed day by day as they go, according to the apostle, from virtue to virtue; that is to say, by mortifying the members of their flesh and turning them into weapons of justice, unto sanctification, through the observance of the commandments of God and of the Church, in the very justice they have received through the grace of Christ, their faith being united with good works, they grow and become more justified, as it is written: He that is just let him become more just. And again: Fear not to make yourself more just until you die. And again: You see that man is justified by his works and not by his faith only. Now this increase of sanctity it is that the Church prays for in these words: 'Give us, O Lord, an increase of faith, hope and charity.'"

God does not always permit the mystic to see his progress, as this might create some danger to his humility, but there is an infallible sign by which one may know at least that one is indeed progressing, this, namely, when the sincere and earnest desire to progress is there. We may stir ourselves up to that holy desire by observing how worldlings are never satisfied with what they are, or with what they have; they always want more and work themselves to death for it. What they do for temporal riches, honor and pleasure, shall we be less eager to do for eternal bliss and glory?

Therefore what others may think of us or do or not do for themselves, let us be up and doing and never relax and never stop till we hear the words of the Divine Master: "Well done, good and faithful servant; enter into the joy of thy Lord."

THE THREE STAGES OF THE MYSTIC LIFE.

In the foregoing chapter we have ascertained this much about progress in the mystic life, that it has to be gradual, steady and illimited. We ought not to fall behind or go backwards, not come to a full stop, not beat around the bush and lose precious time in the byepaths that lead nowhere; not turn in a circle, but go straight forward, on and on, and higher and higher and at as lively a pace as we can, instead of merely crawling along.

Spiritual writers use various comparisons to make us under-

stand at the same time the process of the mystic life and its oneness of design and the stages of it with their necessary consecutiveness.

St. John Climachus compares it to a ladder, St. John of the Cross to a mountain, St. Theresa to a castle, with various mansions, others to a road with relays. St. Benedict in his "Rule" names twelve degrees of humility; Blessed Angela of Foligno describes eighteen steps by which God brought her to the grace of a thorough conversion; Philip of the Most Holy Trinity Carmelite, in his "Theologia Mystica," distinguishes five successive stages of the spiritual life, thus: first, that of the sensible delights of grace immediately upon one's conversion or vocation; second, that of the purification of the senses; third, that of the enlightenment of the understanding; fourth, that of the purifying of the intellect; fifth, that of the perfect union with God.

Truth to tell, there are well nigh innumerable degrees and diversities of graces, and probably no two souls on the way are found to be exactly on the same level, just as no two angels and no two saints in heaven have the same degree of glory. Without therefore entering upon a more detailed account of these many degrees, it will be enough for our purpose to set down at some length the division of the spiritual life into the three classical stages, namely: first, that of the beginners; second, That of the advanced; third, that of the perfect. The treatment of those three stages will cover the whole subject of the degrees of the spiritual life, just as a description of the three periods of childhood, youth and manhood cover that of man; just as an account of the foundations, wall structures and roof that of a house, and will enable us to understand the essential workings of the mystic life.

The first stage, that of the Beginners, is the initiatory one, and is called the way of Purity. Quite a proper appellation, whether the beginner be an innocent child, a virgin soul, since then its main feature is indeed the absence of the contamination of sin; or again, whether the beginner be just coming out of a bad life, because then the main characteristic of this stage for him will be to struggle against sin and vice in order to secure this wonderful prize of purity.

The second stage, or middle one, that of the advanced, is called the Way of Enlightenment, and its main characteristic is ordinarily the acquisition and practice of virtues. To understand which we must bear in mind that the soul of man is the mirror of Godhead. Sin had previously laid on that mirror a thick coating of unutterable filth, and even after that had been done away with by a good confession, the soul emits from its own self the smoke of yet un-

ruly passions which prevent the beams issuing from the countenance of God from being reflected therein. But as soon as the passions shall have been repressed, then the countenance of God will shine freely upon that soul and make it luminous, enlightening it splendidly. If now by the prism of analysis we isolate the rays of divine light which the soul reflects, they will be found to be so many virtues, namely, the theological virtues of Faith, Hope and Charity, the infused moral virtues and the gifts of the Holy Ghost.

The third stage, that of the perfect, is called the Way of Union and its main characteristic is always a very high degree of mental prayer practically uninterrupted. Though such be indeed the main characteristics respectively of the three ways, fight against sin, heroic practice of virtue and mental prayer at its highest, nevertheless we must note also that three elements are all together in each of the three degrees, though in varying proportions. Three is the purification and the enlightenment and the Divine contemplation proper to beginners, and there is the purification practice of virtues and mental prayer proper to the advanced; and, finally, there is also for the perfect still further purification and still higher flights of virtues as well as contemplation at its highest. The spiritual man grows all together and not one part of him after another, as who would say the lower limbs first, then, after a while, the chest, and only at the end the head. No, every part of him is there from the beginning, proportionately small, of course, and every part grows harmoniously with the others, just as the hands and feet and brain and heart of a child will grow with the rest of his body.

It is for having failed to grasp that harmonious, all around development of the spiritual man that modern writers have introduced such unnatural distinctions and separations of things that God meant to go together from the very beginning. Let it be understood, once for all, that even a beginner is to be allowed Divine contemplation and not to be exclusively confined to the dreary occupation of fighting his dominant voice. Here is a very apposite remark of Father R. Buckler, in his book on "Spiritual Perfection:" "No small consolation comes to souls anxious to advance when they understand that the work of their perfection lies in the development of their love." In "Sanctis Sophia," the Ven. Father Baker has one chapter to show how the exercise of love causes illumination. Hence I conclude that souls are to be urged to begin that exercise of love as early as possible.

How will one know that one has succeeded in purifying oneself and is fit for the second stage of the spiritual life? Abbot Cineros

in his exercises of the spiritual life answers: "When one has obtained these three gifts, to wit: first, against sloth, alacrity; second, against concubiscence, self-love; third, against ill-will, kindness, then may the soul without delay climb the high way of enlightenment."

And how shall we know that we can place ourselves in the group of the Advanced. Cardinal Bona in his "*Manuductio ad Coelum*," chap. xix., answers: "When you will have such a mastery over yourself as to possess your soul in unity, when things of this world displease you and you love solitude, and you are athirst after perfection, and you despise the opinions and judgments of men."

Finally, one will be known to have reached the last stage when one has the gift of the presence of God and of the Beatitudes and of the fruits of the Holy Ghost. Divine union is an interior state in which the soul of a man is completely surrendered to the action of the Holy Ghost. In all his willed and deliberate acts that man is in permanent collaboration with God; nay, more, he leaves the initiative to God, to this extent that he will not move himself to anything, but rather will be moved to it by the Holy Ghost, and when the Holy Ghost does not move him to anything in particular, that man is satisfied to remain peacefully in his union with God.

An amazing fact is the comparatively enormous number of those who remain beginners all their lives, very few, even among religious and clerics and secular persons making a profession of piety, very few indeed are those who go beyond the threshold of the mystic life and who answer the loving, pressing invitation of God: "Friend, go up higher."

And it is not all due to indifference or want of generosity, but in many cases simply to ignorance or to want of spiritual direction or altogether to the wrong idea that mystic life in its fullness and perfection is not made for the like of them and that it required a very special vocation.

Now that is a great pity. For it is certain that it requires at least as much effort to keep oneself in the first stage without falling below into downright tepidity as it would to go up higher, as if a man were to try and keep a boat stationary in midstream by force of oars. He would have all the exertions, if not more, without the exilation and advantages of those who pass him and go up stream. Oh, when shall we understand that a traveler, after the first days of fatigue, climbs with greater alacrity the mountain side than he used to walk on low swampy ground? And as he goes up, the air becomes keener and purer and his bouyancy of spirit becomes proportionately greater. And if the objects he left below dwindle into insignificance and he can expect to have but few

companions or none at all in these high solitudes, yet his heart is cheered at the ever widening circle of the horizon and the magnificent prospect of land and sky and at the felt majestic presence of God. So it is also and much more in the progressive stages of the mystic life.

"Give me, O Lord, to understand Thy ways and teach me to walk in Thy paths." (Ps. xxiv., 4.)

DIVISION OF THE MYSTICAL LIFE.

Mystical life is divided into two parts: First, Divine Contemplation, and, second, Saintly Action.

Action and contemplation of some sort are the two elements which are found in the life of every adult human being—be his life either purely natural or supernatural, be it tepid or fervent. With this difference, however, that in the case of the mystic, God is the all in all of his life, whilst in the case of the others, God does not come into it, but self or the creatures are its all in all.

When one is busy about God, when God is the direct, immediate object of one's loving attention, that is Divine Contemplation. In its widest sense, it comprises a great variety of acts—spiritual reading on the divine essence and perfections or on the mysteries of Our Lord; meditation on the same, vocal prayer, certain pious exercises (such as, for instance, the Way of the Cross), celebration of the Holy Sacrifice or participation therein, and finally mental prayer proper.

Saintly action, in contradistinction to Divine Contemplation, is when for the love of God one is busy about something which is not God, and yet so as not to lose one's union with God. In our present condition we cannot be all the time busy with God alone, for two reasons: First, because our natural frailty makes us incapable of such an uninterrupted and exclusive attention to God; second, because also certain duties to ourselves and our neighbors claim a part of our attention for the very honor and service of God. This action, of course, does not necessarily imply bustle and noise and much moving about.

This first grand division of the mystical life into its two parts is set forth in the words of Our Saviour: "The Lord, Thy God, wilt thou adore, and Him only wilt thou serve" (Mat. iv., 10)—*adoration* standing for Divine Contemplation and *service* for Saintly Action.

These two elements are always found in every saintly life upon earth, though, of course, in varying proportion in different persons, and even in the same person at different periods of his or her

progress. As a rule, beginners are more active than contemplative. Certain natures are very little gifted for contemplation, whilst others, on the contrary, vary little for action. But it remains true that every mystic's life is full of these two elements, Divine Contemplation and Sainly Action, as (to use a homely simile) a fresh egg is full of white and yolk. And as in an egg there is no place for anything else, so in the mystic's life there is no place for sinful or even purely natural affections. All is supernatural.

Though Divine Contemplation and Sainly Action are always blended together, still now the one and at other times the other gets the ascendancy. The two phases alternate continually, succeeding each other with a greater stress now upon contemplation than upon action, according to present dispositions and the demands laid upon one by circumstances.

In thus passing from Divine Contemplation and vice versa, one finds the relief that our frail nature craves for. In the sweetness of prayer and contemplation one finds repose from the worries of active life, and, on the other hand, the wholesome distractions of saintly activities help one to bear the heavy weight of divine contemplation.

Again, though contemplation and action are, of necessity, found in the daily life of every mystic on earth, still in some lives one of the two elements so markedly predominates upon the other as to give them its peculiar coloring. Thus the life of some mystics is almost all taken up with the direct occupation of God; they are accordingly called Contemplatives. Such were the fathers of the desert, the holy hermits and recluses of the Middle Ages; such are nowadays Carmelite nuns, Carthusian monks and most of the enclosed religious orders. Others, on the contrary, give a markedly predominant share to saintly activity in the works of mercy, spiritual and corporal. Such are nearly all Christians in the world and many religious institutes, as Sisters of Charity, the teaching orders, the hospitalers, etc. Besides this Contemplative and Active form of life there is a third kind, the Apostolic one, which is the proper form of life of all apostolic men, either secular or regular, of Bishops, priests in the world, missionaries, superiors of whatever kind of religious communities of both sexes. All these persons, on account of their exalted position and of their sacred character and of the special nature of their occupations, have to carry to their maximum of intensity and in their most excellent form and in almost equal measure, both at the same time, Divine Contemplation and Sainly Action.

How are people to be guided in their choice of one or the other

of these three modes of the mystical life? By the holy will of God in their regard. Now this is made manifest by one or the other or all of the following signs: First, one's own natural inclination and special aptitudes; second, the exigencies of circumstances; third, the advice or even command of those in authority over one.

We must be careful when speaking of Action versus Contemplation to give to our words but a relative and conventional value. For indeed adoration or contemplation is action also. The sublimest act of adoration, namely, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, is an action, even a little drama. And contemplation, though it seems repose, is action also; nay, it is action at its highest—it is action at white heat, so to say. All this notwithstanding, it is proper for us to retain the two consecrated terms, being careful to assign to each no more meaning than is agreed upon by all the writers of spirituality.

This may also help one to understand what theologians mean when they contend that in heaven there will be no more action, but only contemplation. It might seem at first a rather dreary outlook, but it only means that in heaven there will be no more defects of our own to correct, as we shall be constituted in a state of perfect charity; nor will there be any distress of our neighbor for us to help by our exertions, as all these, being also established in perfect charity, will be happy. Thus will be suppressed the two forms of saintly action of which we shall presently speak, and we can rejoice over their being no more necessary in heaven. And as for there being in heaven only contemplation, it means that God will at last be manifestly all in all to the blessed; that He will be the unfailing object of their enjoyment, both in Himself directly and indirectly, in the other blessed, whether taken individually or collectively. They will have so perfectly become forms of God, filled with God, reflecting God; their loving one another, their conversations, songs, dances, flights through space, solemn processions, exploring of all the depth and width and height of the material universe and of the wonderful world of the spirits—all this will be but so many manifestations of the divine joy overflowing in all the channels of their created natures.

When the blessed will be contemplating God in Himself, it will be *Contemplatio Matutina* (as theologians call it); when enjoying Him in their own selves and His other works, it will be *Contemplatio Vespertina*; thus it will always be Divine Contemplation, and yet with a good deal of action and motion on the part of the blessed. They will pass from the direct contemplation of the divine essence in itself to the indirect contemplation of it in its works and vice

versa, with ever renewed eagerness and never satiated appetite and with a full expansion of all their faculties of body and soul—only those of the purely vegetative life being abolished, as their providential function, in the great scheme of things created, will then be at an end. It is what the apostle signifies in the words, “Meat for the belly and the belly for the meats; but God shall destroy both it and them.” It does not mean that any part of the body will be wanting to its integrity, in the resurrection of the blessed, but that its lower functions will be no more, as it will have entered into the glorious life of the spirit. Now, all the other enjoyments either of body or of mind, of senses, memory, imagination, intellect, will, bodily motion, the artistic faculty, etc.—all these will be carried to their highest powers and fullest exercise. In this sense, oh! yes, there will be action, intense action, of each one of the blessed personally and then of all of them in groups and in their universality—action of so grand a description that it is for us at present absolutely unimaginable.

This much to help us understand the relative and restricted meaning to give to these two terms of mystical theology—Action, Contemplation.

SUBDIVISION OF THE MYSTICAL LIFE AND CO-ORDINATION OF ITS PARTS.

Saintly Action is subdivided into two parts, namely, Interior Action and External Action.

When the object of one's saintly action is one's own self, when man is busy putting to rights his own affections, eradicating vices and planting virtues in his soul, then it is called Interior Action, because it all takes place within. When, on the other hand, the object of our saintly activities is the world of creatures outside, principally our neighbor, to perform towards them the offices of justice and charity, then it is called External Action.

This gives us in last analysis the division of the mystical life into these three parts:

First, Divine Contemplation, in the broadest sense.

Second, Internal Saintly Action or Ascetics proper.

Third, External Saintly Action or Good Works—Divine Contemplation coming first, Saintly Action only second and subordinate, and in saintly action that which has our own selves for its object, passing before that which has for its object things or persons outside us. So that our saintly interior action appears to be the immediate fruit of our divine contemplation, and, furthermore, our saintly external action is shown to be the offspring, so to say, of these two united, viz., divine contemplation and saintly interior action. When one has renounced self by saintly interior action and been

filled with God by divine contemplation, it is inevitable that one should overflow in all deeds of charity and kindness over one's neighbor.

It is necessary to insist on the union and consecutiveness and subordination of the parts of mystical life. In our opinion, much of the conspicuous failure of modern piety is due to the ignorance or wilful disregard of this doctrine. A complaint is raised sometimes that active life is destructive of piety, or again that contemplation disqualifies one for apostolic work, as though these two, divine contemplation and saintly action, were antagonistic. Far from this being the case, the one cannot be without the other; the one may not be sacrificed for the sake of the other, or they both perish; only they must be given each their proper comparative degree of precedence or subordination. One must be careful not to, under pretext of the exigencies of active life, neglect prayer and the care of one's own interior. Is it not remarkable that the rule of St. Benedict, which has formed some of the greatest workers, whether in the fields of erudition, or in those of apostolic zeal, or in those of the material arts of civilization, gives no distinct directions as to external work? It is wholly taken up with the care of forming the man of prayer and of ascetic habits, and that is all, and it has proved enough, for the Benedictine monk thus found himself quite fitted out for all these works of zeal.

The order of the Ten Commandments of God bears this coördination of the parts of mystical life out. The first three Commandments set forth our duty to God or Divine Contemplation in its widest meaning. The last seven Commandments, though they only mention our neighbor, have for their very first effect (and that is self-evident) to impose and to produce order in our own hearts, by interior action, before even it can take effect in our dealings with our brethren by external action. For, says Our Lord, "It is from the fullness of the heart that the mouth speaketh" (Mat. xii., 34), and again, "From the heart come forth evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false testimonies, blasphemies" (Mat. xv., 19).

It is not difficult to discover again that same coördination of the parts of mystical life inculcated in the first three petitions of the Our Father: First, "Hallowed be Thy Name," which is done by divine worship, both public and private, or divine contemplation. Next, "Thy kingdom come," which is procured by obedience to the laws of God, which obedience has first to be established in the heart by interior action. Finally, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," which can be realized only by our taking in hand the in-

terests of God in the whole world by saintly external action. There we see how wide is the range of saintly external action. Besides his immediate duties of state to those around him, the mystic is deeply concerned about his neighbor and actively employs himself in his behalf. He does not ask, to answer it in the negative, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Every form of distress of body or soul forcibly appeals to him, and he lays himself out to relieve it in the measure of his power. He will do it the more efficaciously that he is the more dead to self by previous saintly interior action and the more united to God by Divine Contemplation.

Our duty to God goes before that to ourselves or to others, because it is the very reason of our duty to ourselves or our neighbor. And it is good for us that contemplation should thus hold the first place, for we do more and we gain more for ourselves and others when we are with God, when we attend to God, than in any other way. We can be enabled to perform our duty to ourselves and our neighbor only through the help of the grace of God, which is obtained by prayer and the sacraments; that is, by direct intercourse with God, which is an act of divine contemplation.

Even irrespective of our manifold relations to Him, God claims our loving attention first, and more than either ourselves or the whole universe of things, precisely on account of His transcendental excellence. Loving attention to God, or Divine Contemplation of some sort, ought, according to St. Thomas, to be the first use man makes of his reason when he comes to know himself and to discern good from evil. By divine command, loving attention to God ought to fill and sanctify the first day of each week. A Christian need not be told that it ought also to be the very first act in the morning of each day. Loving attention to God, according to Holy Writ, is to be our ever recurring care, our constant and paramount occupation, the most engrossing one, the one about which we be most solicitous. And so it is to the mystic. In the words of the sacred liturgy, he confesses that "*Verè dignum et justum est, oequum et salutare, nos tibi, semper et ubique, gratias agere*" ("It is truly just and right and good and wholesome for us to always and everywhere give thanks to God"). The non-mystics, truth to tell, do not feel quite so keenly about it, but they are all wrong.

This doctrine of the supremacy and primacy of Divine Contemplation holds good (within certain limits) for sinners freshly converted as well as saints. It would be a fatal mistake to say, "Let them first put some kind of order in their interior before they be permitted or induced to apply themselves to any sort of contemplation; when *that* will have been done, then, and *only then*, may

they turn to God." No, no! Let them, first of all things, turn to God, that they may be enabled, through love of Him and by His grace, to put their interior in order. Besides, this right ordering of one's interior is a work of long standing; it cannot be accomplished all at once, whilst on the other hand the precept of communion with God is pressing urgently and constantly and may not be postponed. "We ought always to pray and not to faint" (Luke xviii., 1). Moreover, God is the Master of His own ways and bestows His gifts as He pleases without following any set rule known to human wisdom; now, if He sees fit to give graces of prayer to a beginner (as observation proves that He often does), it is not for us to tell Him nay.

This doctrine of the primacy or precedence of Divine Contemplation holds good even for young children. When Our Lord said, "Suffer the little children to come to Me," He gave us to understand that He wishes them to draw near Him by a contemplation proportionate to the development of their faculties. And how the magnificent gesture of Pius X., convoking all the little ones to communion and even to daily communion, confirms this view!

Writers who tell us that sinners and children are incapable of Divine Contemplation have in mind the acme and perfection of Divine Contemplation which certainly is acquired but very late in spiritual life. But this notwithstanding, it remains true that one is called upon to make *acts, occasional acts*, of Divine Contemplation long before one reaches perfection; nay, at the very outset of Christian life. Of this distinction between the acts and the habit of Divine Contemplation we shall have more to say later. Let all that has been said in this chapter suffice for the present to place it beyond the possibility of a doubt that, at whatever stage of the mystic life, God comes first by Divine Contemplation; next to God, ourselves, by Internal Saintly Action; and the last thing is our relations to persons and things outside by External Saintly Action.

THE CO-WORKERS IN THE MYSTICAL LIFE—THE MYSTIC AND THE BLESSED TRINITY.

Mystical Life is an experimental perception, dim, but intensely real, of the Blessed Trinity.

The Most Holy Trinity is the mystery of mysteries—one mystery; in fact, the One, Great, Living Mystery, and, in itself, the simplest of all—it is the God; and when this has been said, what more can be added?

But to his intellectual creatures, angels and men, the Blessed Trinity is rather an immense sheaf or cluster of mysteries, each

single ray of which is of an absolutely dazzling effulgence to the purblind eyes of man in his present condition. No matter; the mystic enjoys basking in the consciousness of that mighty radiance, even as a blind man in the glowing warmth of the sun.

To the unspiritual the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity is simply a matter of faith and appears only in the light of a speculative truth, having no real bearing upon the inner life of the soul. But the truth is that the life of every Christian, even if he does not advert to the fact, is all mixed up, so to say, with the very life of God with the three Divine Persons. The Christian is assumed into the very life of God, and the life of God is actually lived in a special manner in the Christian himself.

Now the mystic is he who, moved by the grace of God, adverts to these wondrous facts, is made conscious of them and finds his delights therein. Let us try and understand this.

God, we know, by the united testimony of reason and revelation, is His own dwelling place. He is to Himself an inexhaustible fountain of purest bliss, ever flowing within Himself. He is His own life—deep, hidden, never going out of itself for its nourishment, naturally unapproachable and naturally incommunicable to the creature. God is to Himself all in all. He is that, else He would not be the Absolute Good; He would not be God.

What are the acts of His divine life? What are, so to say, its pulsations? They are these two, namely, to know and to love; but to know and to love what? Evidently His own divine Self. Now, faith tells us that in the very act of God contemplating Himself there is formed in God an image of Him, living, substantial, a perfect likeness of its original, a second Person, inducing between these two first the relation of Father and Son. Further, we are informed that in the act of mutual complacency which cannot fail to spring up between these two infinitely lovely persons there is formed in God a Third Person, His Spirit, the substantial love of the Father and of the Son, the Holy Ghost, which closes the circle of the Divine Life and makes it perfect.

If God made a world of angels and men together with this splendid material universe, it is not that they add the tiniest drop to His full measure of bliss in Himself, but simply that He wants angels and men to share in that bliss all His own, to drink with Him eternally and be inebriated in that limitless Ocean of Absolute Good that He is; to be, by a wonderful privilege in no way due to the creature, made partakers of His own divine life. As the three Divine Persons of the Godhead are infinitely involved in the existence of one another, so it seems that they have willed that we

be also involved in them and they in us. The whole economy of the supernatural order is planned and worked to that end.

The first step towards carrying out such a design has been for God to make angels and men, naturally to His own image and likeness, for thus only could He love us, no object inferior to Him being worthy of God's complacency. Thus what God loves in us is what He has put there of His own divine Self: His image. His likeness, our natural capacity to know Him and to love Him, and, besides, in the supernatural order, the manifold wondrous gifts of His grace. And in the measure as we allow God to make us, through grace, more and more like unto Him, more and more knowing Him and loving Him, in that same measure does He also love us more and more and communicate to us His own sanctity and bliss.

Thus even in our present condition of trial under sin (as we are a fallen race) we may begin, by faith, to know God as He is, namely, as one God in three Divine Persons, and to love Him, though, alas! so inadequately; pending the time soon to come, when, if we shall have been faithful, we shall see Him face to face and love Him at last perfectly, sharing His essential bliss in Himself, without let or hindrance. We may even now, through prayer and the sacraments, be brought under the veil of faith into intimate relations with each one of the Divine Persons.

The grateful, lively recognition of all these things by the Christian makes him a mystic. Oh! with what rapture does he then pay distinct and special attention to each of the three Divine Persons: to the Father who so loved him as to give him His only Son; to the Son who so loved him as to give him His only and Redeemer, to the Holy Ghost who so loves him as to constitute Himself his perpetual Guest, his actual and everlasting possession? Yes, says the mystic, to build me up into the greater likeness of the grace of God now, and later on of His glory, it takes no less than those three Divine Persons, and, moreover, my willing coöperation.

Thus consciously to coöperate with God, to work with the three Divine Persons, to become sensible of how God builds one up upon, or rather into His own divine Essence, that is mystical life. Through the operations of grace, God lives in a special manner within us. He vividly reverberates there His own divine life, and through holy contemplation the mystic becomes an enamored witness of that unspeakable mystery.

People talk sometimes of the exercise of the Presence of God; to a true mystic there is no exercise there. To remember God and

live with Him does not cost him an effort. To him the most Holy Trinity is the great fact before which all else pales into insignificance. To him the Blessed Trinity is the great reality, which he meets constantly, which produces and fills and sustains and lights up and beautifies everything and overflows everywhere infinitely. The mystic sees the whole world as a tiny thing in one ray of the glory of the triune God.

The most Holy Trinity is the promised land of mystical life. In this regard there happens in spirit to the mystic all that happened to the Hebrews when they went out of Egypt. The passage of the Red Sea is a good general confession which drowns in the waves of the blood of Jesus Christ all the proud army of Pharaoh, chariots and horsemen, vices and mortal sins: all buried, never to rise again! Then one enters into the desert; that is, the world begins to appear quite empty and barren and life in it no better than an aimless roaming about. Soon, however, one receives the law of love in two tables, though still experiencing the mutinies of the flesh: for whilst the spirit is with God on the mountain of contemplation, the inferior part murmurs and rebels and has to be sternly rebuked. (Way of Purity and way of Illumination all these.) Finally, after a more or less protracted beating about and moving from camp to camp, one passes the Jordan miraculously and takes possession of the promised land of the conscious, unmistakable, relished Presence of God: this happens when, through an inestimable special grace of God, one is moved definitely to bid adieu to all things created, that one may live to God alone.

Then not only does the mystic live to God, but he dwells in God; the Blessed Trinity becomes his dwelling place. To the vivid, conscious faith of that man the Divine Essence, unseen, becomes the very place of his abode during the rest of his earthly life.

Now, the Blessed Trinity, in which the mystic thus lives consciously, proves to him sometimes a very Paradise of delights; that is, when he is given to taste how sweet God is; then again, at other times the Blessed Trinity becomes to him a very Purgatory; that is, when the scorching rays of the intolerable sanctity and justice of God are made to shine full upon him, to burn away the rust of his sins and imperfections. Be this as it may, that man does not dwell in himself, nor in the creatures of this world; he dwells in God, the most Holy Trinity, to whom he belongs for ever!

HOW GOD THE FATHER MAKES HIMSELF THE PRIME MOVER OF THE
MYSTICAL LIFE.

Now we must proceed to consider in detail and separately the special, distinct and active relations which each of the Divine Per-

sons deigns to sustain towards the child of grace, the Christian, bearing in mind that mystical life consists in the lively apprehension by the Christian of this state of affairs between God and him, together with an active correspondence on his part, to these several distinct operations of the Divine Persons. As we go on the marvel of our supernatural union with God will appear more startling, almost at every step.

In this chapter I want to show what special, active function God the Father deigns to appropriate to Himself in regard to the Christian, and how the mystic is made to realize it plainly by a sort of inward experimental feeling. It is all summed up in the words of St. John: "Behold what manner of charity the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called and should be the sons of God" (I. John iii., 1), and in these other words of St. Paul: "For the Spirit Himself giveth testimony to our spirit that we are the sons of God." (Rom. viii., 16.)

To the unspiritual, God the Father is almost a stranger, seen as it were, at an immense distance, too far away altogether for much notice; Our Lord seems, of course, a good deal nearer and perhaps the only Divine Person who has somehow a direct, immediate relation with us, whilst the Holy Ghost is really nowhere to be perceived. How grossly erroneous such a view is will soon appear.

First of all, let us observe that God the Father, who is the principle of all *in divinis*, is thereby also necessarily the principle of all *extra divina*; whence it follows that He is therefore also the very first principle of our mystical life, the very Prime-Mover of it. Consequently, as one trained in the logic of the schoolmen will readily admit, God the Father is absolutely the very first object the mystic ought to keep in view, and the one he ought to strain every nerve to attain and the one he will certainly attain in the end. God the Father, who is the prime-mover and because He is the prime-mover, is also the last end of our mystical life.

"I go to the Father," said Our Lord, speaking of the consummation of His earthly life. "I go to the Father," may the mystic truly say, speaking of the whole process and final consummation of his spiritual life. "Be ye perfect as your Heavenly Father is perfect," Our Lord tells us. As who would say: Understand that the whole gist and purpose of the supernatural order is to bring you to the Father; to make you first, as far your created capacity admits of, good as He, holy as He, nay, even rich as He in the possession of His Son and His Holy Spirit, pending the time when He will crown all His gifts by giving Himself also to you, making

you thereby even happy as He. There you have the perfect circle, the whole evolution of mystical life.

So the Christian, or more strictly, the mystic is a man who goes to the Father. But how does he go to the Father, and how does the Father meet him and receive him? Even as a son! The mystic goes to the Father even as a son, because God the Father has made him son and treats him as son, and will ultimately receive him home in heaven as son. This we must now try to express more fully. When a man is baptized, what happens? That man who a few hours or days, or perhaps years previous, was born of an earthly father and mother into a fallen race, the great human family, with an ancestral curse or blight upon his soul, with his purely natural faculties not even whole and unimpaired, to a life of many miseries, to be followed by death, in this nether natural world—that man has been by virtue of the sacrament and the operation of the Holy Ghost (*ex aquâ et Spiritu sancto*) born again, begotten of God (*ex Deo nati sunt*), cleansed of the original sin, and, if he be an adult, of all his personal ones. He has been grafted upon the true vine, the natural Son of God, Our Lord Jesus Christ (*Ego vitis, vos palmites*), given a share of the divine nature (*divinæ consortes naturæ*), filled with the Holy Spirit, assumed into the great family of the saints (*cives sanctorum et domestici Dei, superædificati super fundamentum Apostolorum et Prophetarum*). He has been marked in the very substance of his soul with an indelible character of supernatural resemblance, endowed with the new faculties of faith, hope and charity which illumine the darkness of his natural intellect and strengthen the weakness of his natural will. He has been enriched with the infusion of all moral virtues, further enriched by the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, with a perennial well of special graces springing up in his very soul to refresh it and make it fruitful unto life everlasting (*Fiet in eo fons aquæ salientis in vitam æternam*): all these things, in view, ultimately, of the essential beatific vision, to be granted him, though by strict right it should be the exclusive privilege of God alone. Here is a new thing altogether, a new being: what was before a natural man changed now supernaturally into a very son of God. His sonship of God is not as was his sonship of his earthly parents, *in perfectam similitudinem naturæ*: that is impossible, from the fact of his being a creature, and therefore finite, and therefore incapable of the full communication of the divine likeness. Nor is he made son of God as the Divine Word, by a natural, substantial and necessary process; no, his sonship is by way of adoption, is accidental and gratuitous (*Voluntarie genuit nos*), and

therefore infinitely inferior to the sonship of the Divine Word. Yet even when these limitations have been duly made it appears all magnificent and a true participation of the sonship of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity. St. Augustine, in Ps. 26 Enarr. xi., 2, distinctly says that we are "divinely associated with the mystery of the eternal generation." God the Father, eternal and natural Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ, adopts also the Christian as His own very son, makes him also heir of His kingdom of heaven, really and truly coheir with His natural, Divine Son, even as though that man had been also born of His own divine substance and had the same natural rights as His Son consubstantial with Him.

Once the child is born he must grow and wax strong and become a man and do a man's work. For this purpose he must be fed, and this care naturally devolves upon the parent. In the course of nature, whilst the child is yet little, that is provided for in the tender, touching way we know, by the mother giving the breast to her young one and letting him suck his nourishment out of her own substance. Then as he grows and waxes strong he is weaned from the breast and given other nourishment proper to his age, bread and meat from the inexhaustible store of kindly nature, so that in time he may be relied upon to do a man's work. In the order of grace it is God the Father who takes upon Himself to attend to the proper feeding of the Christian, according to the stage of his spiritual growth. He says in Is. lxvi., 12, "You shall be carried to the breasts, and upon the knees they shall caress you." And in Is. lxxx., 11, "I am the Lord thy God who brought thee out of Egypt; open thy mouth wide and I will fill it." The mystic, that fledgling of divine love, does open his mouth wide, shows himself insatiable of God, crying incessantly for more, and the Heavenly Father, as a loving Pelican, fills him constantly with more and more of His divine life and substance. For we must observe here that though the Christian, when made son of God, is not born of the divine substance (this being the exclusive privilege of the only natural Son, the Word of God), he is, nevertheless, fed with the divine substance.

We are made to pray thus: "Our Father . . . give us this day our supersubstantial bread." We call for a kind of food which God the Father is to draw out of His own divine substance, for a bread made up of these two elements kneaded together: His own Divine Word and His own substantial love, and in answer to the prayer God the Father by a marvellous secret operation begets His Divine Son in him, and through His Divine Son produces in

that man, by a special presence of love, also His Holy Spirit.* Now, will he be able to do his work of a Christian and show himself the worthy son of the Father?

This makes it plain that the whole supernatural life consists in receiving from the Father and in duly giving back to the Father. Receiving what? His Divine Son and His Holy Spirit. And giving back to Him what? A son, another Jesus, our very self-made one with the Son, and actuated by the Holy Ghost. "For whosoever are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. (Rom. viii., 14.) "That you may be sons of the Father in heaven," says Our Lord when He enjoins upon us the most heroic acts of charity, in the love of our enemies; acts which cannot be performed by man, except with the most powerful help of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. Now perhaps we begin to perceive something of what passes between the mystic and God the Father. Marvellous to relate, the Heavenly Father, on His part, brings into the life in common with the child of His dilection, the Christian, all that is His own, namely, His very self, who is the wellspring of the Godhead, and His Divine Son and His Holy Spirit, keeping nothing back; only that it is all under the veil of faith, as man in his present condition could not bear to see the splendor of God thus investing him. And the mystic on his part brings into this life, in common with the Heavenly Father, his whole self. It is little enough, and who is more keenly alive to that fact than the mystic himself? But it is all he has. His whole self, body and soul and faculties, high and low: the whole tree, root and branch, with all its actual production of fruits and possibilities and promises for the future. God the Father, natural Father of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, constitutes Himself by an act of His will Father also of the Christian, impressing in the substance of his soul a special sign of supernatural resemblance, actively begetting him to the divine life; and the Christian on his part, when he is a mystic, actually, actively, consciously and constantly takes God the Father for his own Father and endeavors to reproduce and to prolong in his whole life and in all his acts the very sonship of the Divine Word, to which he has been so lovingly associated.

For there is this remarkable thing about it all, that whereas the son of a man cannot increase his sonship any more than he could have chosen his earthly father, the child of grace, on the contrary,

* It is not a question here, as is obvious, of the Holy Eucharist; we shall come to that in due course; but it may be as well to note here that each of the three Divine Persons has His own way of contributing to the growth of the child of grace. I am in this chapter stating the way of God the Father.

can always and freely choose God for his Father, and it is in his power at every moment to effectually increase his sonship. Now, the mystic does so all the time, more and more, and with what delight! But is it really the mystic who does it? Is it not rather God the Father who operates in him the *velle et perficere* of his sonship? Truth to tell, it is both together, God and the mystic, by their joint action.

And whereas, through natural generation man receives from his parents only a life like theirs, but not their own; a life numerically distinct from theirs, separate and independent: through his supernatural generation the Christian receives a life which is not distinct, nor separated from, nor independent of the divine life as it is lived in the Heavenly Father; it is identical with the divine life, numerically one with it; it is that selfsame divine life as much as the narrow limits of man's being and the play of his free will allow it to make irruption into him. During his earthly pilgrimage, then, the mystic endeavors to, as much as is possible to so small a being, reproduce in himself the sanctity, goodness, love and all perfection of the Heavenly Father, even as does the Divine Word in Him, even as did in His earthly life the Word made man, Our Lord Jesus Christ. So his delight, his very food, is to do his Father's will. As a loving, dutiful son, he works diligently at the part of his Father's vineyard assigned to him by his state of life and by the providential course of events. "I must be about my Father's business," he constantly says to himself and to those around him who marvel at the strangeness of his behavior and, for that matter, to the whole world. And on the other hand, day by day, God the Father transforms the mystic gradually more and more into the likeness of His Divine Son; more and more He lays hands, by the agency of the Holy Ghost, upon all the faculties of that man, to make him perform wonderful acts of edification in the Church and bring out as a branch of the true vine fruits worthy of eternal life, and even "He purges it that it may bring more fruit." (John xv., 2.) Such are, feebly described, the mutual relations of God the Father and the mystic.

A last thing to note in this matter is that God the Father, though so loving and generous in His dealing with the mystic, does not as yet give Himself to him as an object of direct, immediate enjoyment. He gives us His Divine Son and His Holy Spirit to be enjoyed by us even now, under the veil of faith, but He reserves for us the enjoyment of Himself as the supreme gift in the land of the blessed. It was no doubt in allusion to this fact that St. Aloysius Gonzaga in his last illness wrote with characteristic in-

sight: "It cannot be long before I go to receive the embraces of the Eternal Father, in whose bosom I hope to find secure and everlasting rest."

THAT THE BEATIFIC VISION IS THE END OF THE MYSTICAL LIFE.

Si filii, et hæredes.
If sons, therefore heirs also.

As the souls of the just, before Christ, were received into Abraham's bosom and dwelt there in the serenity of peace, joyfully looking forward to the coming of Our Lord and their own transference to heaven, so also, in much the same manner, the mystic lives consciously with the Son of God and the Holy Ghost and all the children of God, known and unknown, visible and invisible, in the bosom of the Father, "of whom are all things, and we unto Him." (I. Cor. vii., 6.) The mystic dwells there contentedly, lovingly and consciously, though still in the darkness of our present condition, awaiting the coming of the Bridegroom, and the lifting up of the veil and the grand revelation of the Father. "Lord, show us the Father, and it is enough for us," said St. Philip, with more pregnant truth than he was aware.

Now, we know that the whole Christian life is ordained to that end, the granting of the Beatific Vision to predestined man. Everything in the economy of Providence is for the furthering of that sublime design of God. The whole supernatural order of grace is for the purpose of making man both worthy and capable of the Beatific Vision. It will (therefore) enable us the better to understand those very means of grace of which we shall have later to speak at length: Prayer, the sacraments and all the details of mystical life, as well as the great works of God, *ad extra*, creation, the missions of the Son and the Holy Ghost, redemption by the Cross, the mystery of Holy Church, if we take here and now a proper view of the end itself of it all, which is none other than the Beatific Vision.

What then is the Beatific Vision? In what does it precisely consist? What does it mean and what does it imply? Let us proceed slowly, cautiously, gradually and weigh every word of ours in such a difficult and at the same time entrancing subject.

The Beatific Vision is the vision of God. But what sort of a vision? The vision of God even as He is; the vision of God even as God Himself enjoys it; the vision of God as He granted it to His blessed angels immediately after their trial—the vision, the vivid perception, the really taking in of the Absolute Good, that is to say, of all beauty, sanctity, loveliness and other infinite per-

fections as they are in God. "Come," says He to Moses, "and I will show thee all good."

It is called Beatific, because God, being the Absolute Good, the effect of such a vision is to make absolutely happy as well as unfaillingly good, whomsoever enjoys it.

Beatific Vision is the popular appellation. Now, if we attend chiefly to the manner of it, we should describe it as a sort of direct, immediate vision of God, without any go-between, without anything interfering, whether as an obstacle or as a help. Nothing can help one to see God as he is in Himself. Beatific Vision is not in the soul by way of representation or image as are the things of this world in our senses and imagination and in our intellect: there can be no image of the Infinite. It is a direct intuition of God, hence also that other name "Intuitive Vision."

But it would certainly be more satisfactory to a philosophical mind to call it by a name describing its very nature rather than its manner or its effect; then it should be called the "Essential Vision," because that really tells in what it consists, namely, in the perception of God by means of His very essence; or, in other words, in the union of the very essence of God with him who perceives it. (Thus we see that) the Beatific Vision will be a more intimate and lively process than our vision of the natural world, of a scenery, of a person, or of any material object before our eyes; because such a vision of natural objects is made only through an image of these being formed in us, and not through an immediate union of them with us, whilst, on the contrary, the Beatific Vision is caused through nothing else but an immediate union of the Divine Essence with the beholder of it. The Beatific Vision, then, will not be a dead thing, merely spectacular and outside us, as the universe is, and with the distant, unsympathetic coldness of nature; it will be a grand, living, personal fact, throbbing in us as our human heart, taking hold of our whole being, inside and out, knitting itself with every fibre of our soul and body and making us one with God.

It is obvious that God alone has a natural right and aptitude to the Beatific Vision. It is identical with Himself. It is all His own; His property, His personal good, His naturally unalienable and unapproachable privilege, His fenced-round and sealed kingdom of bliss and glory. Neither man, nor mightiest angel, nor yet any other more exalted being which God might create could lay claim to the Beatific Vision or be naturally capable of it. The Beatific Vision, as it is in God, as it is experienced by God, is one and the same thing with God Himself, one and the same thing

with His very life, with His divine operations *ad intra*, and the Trinity of His Persons. To speak in a human way, it is consequent upon, or rather concurrently with, the vision or perception of His infinite goodness that God utters His Word; a true, living, perfect, infinite expression of His very self, establishing between Him who utters His Word and the Word which is being uttered the relations of Father and Son. And as both the Father and the Son have mutually the intuition of Their infinite loveliness, They love each other with such a perfect, infinite, essential and substantial love that it constitutes a Third Person in God, namely, the Holy Ghost, thus completing the cycle of the divine life and the fullness of the Beatific Vision as it is in God.

Now, what a stupendous condescension on the part of God to have called His rational creatures, the angel first and then man, to share with Him the delights of the Beatific Vision! But what a tremendous effort (again to speak in a human way) it must have required to raise the creature to a level with God Himself, especially in the case of man after the original fall! None can see God but God Himself; then man must be somehow made God, that is to say, must be raised to a divine state, constituted into a divine manner of being; the divine essence must be infused into him and so penetrate his whole personality as to make of him a wholly divine being; he must have the very life of God in him; then he will be capable of the Beatific Vision and have a right to it. A man in the state of grace, a new born infant just baptized, is capable of the Beatific Vision; in the words of St. John: "He hath eternal life abiding in him" (I. John iii, 15), that is to say, the very life of God. Thus it will be seen that "supernatural" does not only mean something above the level of created or creatable beings, but something on a level with God.

The effort has been made on the part of God in the connected works of Creation, Incarnation, Redemption, the institutions of the Church and the application through the seven sacraments of the merits of Jesus Christ to all men of good will. Now, this mighty effort on the part of God calls for a corresponding strenuous effort on the part of man to coöperate with God, and that is done by a man living the Christian life in its very fullness; that is, the mystical life as we are trying to describe it here. Christian life, then, is a sort of deification of man, is the making of man into God, and mystical life is, on the part of man, his really acting his Godlike part.

Mystical life, by the attention it pays to God present everywhere and in one's very self, and by the intense, if dim perception of

each of the three Divine Persons' active relations with one, through the efficacy of the sacraments, and by a laying oneself always more and more open to all the divine influences, and by a contemplation assiduous, keen, pure of the divine perfections and the tasting, under the veil of faith, of the divine sweetness: mystical life, we say, is an apprenticeship of the Beatific Vision. Nothing short of that. Mystical life is a most topical preparation of man to the Beatific Vision, a training and a raising up of all his faculties to the coming glory, a fusing of all his being into the Being of God, a foreshadowing of the Beatific Vision and a prelude to it.

With the Beatific Vision in prospect, the mystics of all ages and professions have found nothing too arduous, no apostolate too exacting, no martyrdom too cruel, no self-restraint too protracted, no desert or solitude too horrible, no humiliation too great, no service too low or repulsive. In all hardships and tribulations they go repeating with the Apostle: "The sufferings of this time are not worthy to be compared with the glory to come that shall be revealed in us." (Rom. vii., 18.)

The mystic bears in mind that the degree of his Beatific Vision will be according to the degree of charity he will have achieved whilst on earth; he considers that time is given us for this only purpose, that we may work out our own rank in the grand hierarchy of perfect charity and divine happiness, and therefore he is very careful not to lose a single moment of time, not to let pass a single opportunity of enlarging his capacity of seeing and loving and enjoying God for evermore. Indeed, the measure of our state of grace when we die will be the measure of our *Lumen Gloriæ*, or Light of Glory, throughout the blessed eternity.

Other words of St. Paul in the same Epistle to the Romans are to the point here. He says: "For the expectation of the creature waiteth for the revelation of the sons of God." (Rom. vii., 19.) It seems as if the whole creation had been taken into the confidence of God and informed of what He has planned for man and was actually in a fever of expectation to see it done. And why so, if not because the whole material universe finds its perfection in man and is raised in him to a share of the glory of supernatural life? Hence the whole creation will in a way be thrilled with joy when man will have been admitted to the Beatific Vision, even as it is said that "the stars with cheerfulness have shined forth to Him that made them." (Baruc. iii., 35.) It is clear that all this material universe which is without rational knowledge or free will has been made distinctly with a view to the bringing about of the Beatific Vision in man. It does help man in his ascent to the Beatific

Vision. It is destined ultimately to be, in some way and through us, assumed into the glory of the Beatific Vision on the day of general resurrection and the Last Judgment, when sea and land will give up their dead, and there will take place the grand, public, solemn "revelation of the sons of God" and there will be made a new heaven and a new earth. Then, indeed, we shall understand the full meaning of the words: "If sons, therefore heirs also."

THAT THE DIVINE WORD IS THE BRIDEGROOM.

One of the most magnificent and explicit prophecies of the wonders of Christian life is set forth in Osee ii., 18-20, in these stupendous words: "And in that day I will espouse thee to Me for ever, and I will espouse thee to Me in justice and judgment and in mercy and in commiserations. And I will espouse thee in faith, and thou wilt know that I am the Lord."

But "the thoughts of mortal men are timid" (Wisdom ix., 14), and this timidity of the thoughts of men appears especially in regard to this subject of the wedding of the Creator with his rational creature. Men dare not believe in this, the grandest reality of spiritual life. They would fain tell the writer or preacher who proclaims it, "Hold! How dare you say such a thing?" They are of opinion that the comparison of two human lovers in that most amazing relation of holy matrimony, as a symbol of our union with God, goes beyond the actual truth and beyond the real thoughts of God, whilst on the contrary, if anything, it lags immeasurably behind and falls immeasurably short of expressing the strength and intimacy and tenderness of the mutual relation which God wants to establish between Himself and the soul.

The *Canticle of Canticles* bears out this truth most vividly, only it does not tell us, not any more than the above passage of Osee, which of the three Divine Persons it is who speaks in the character of Bridegroom. It needed the fullness of revelation of the New Testament to make us know that the Bridegroom is the second Person of the Most Holy Trinity; that is, the Word of God. Now, indeed, with the light of the Gospel thrown back upon the Canticle of Canticles and kindred passages in the Old Testament, how well even their most mysterious expressions are seen to fit to the two natures in Jesus Christ, to the events of His life and of His sacred passion, to His Eucharistic Sacrifice and Sacrament, and to all His personal dealings with us in the secret mystical life!

Thus St. John the Baptist calls Him the Bridegroom and compares his own mission of Precursor to that of a *paranymphos*, or that friend of the bridegroom whose duty it was to stand watch at

the door of the bridal chamber. Our Lord calls Himself the Bridegroom. To the disciples of John, who were finding fault with His own disciples because they did not perform as many fasts as themselves or the Pharisees, He answers: "Can the children of the Bridegroom mourn as long as the Bridegroom is with them? But the days will come when the Bridegroom will be taken away from them, and then they shall fast" (Math. ix., 15). Again, in Math. xxiv.-xxv., He says: "Wherefore be you also ready, because at what hour you know not the Son of man will come. . . . Then shall the kingdom of heaven be like to ten virgins, who, taking their lamps, went out to meet the bridegroom." In the Apocalypse, where so many marvelous, mysterious things are revealed to us about the Lamb, He is at last in chapters xxi. and xxii. given his title of Bridegroom. It is a page of surpassing beauty. "And I, John, saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And there came one of the seven angels and spoke with me, saying, 'Come and I will show thee the bride, the wife of the Lamb.' . . . And the Lord God of the spirits of the prophets sent His angels to show His servants the things that must be done, and He said, 'Behold, I will come quickly.' . . . And the spirit and the bride say come; and he that heareth, let him say come. . . . He that giveth testimony of these things saith, 'Surely I come quickly. Amen. Come, Lord Jesus.'"

Truth to tell, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity sustains towards the Christian what may seem at first sight a bewildering multiplicity of relations. The Word of God has made Himself our blood relation, our true brother, by assuming our human nature. He has made Himself our pattern and our teacher in His life and Gospel doctrine, and our saviour by dying on the Cross. Then, through baptism, he has made the Christian His living member, in His mystical body, the Church, of which He is the Head. Then He makes Himself our very food in Holy Communion, whilst in the other sacraments He anoints and consecrates and sanctifies the Christian's body and soul, with His Holy Spirit and the virtue of His own merits for most special and accurately determined spiritual purposes. In confirmation the Son of God makes us His soldiers and therefore constitutes Himself our Captain. In the sacrament of penance He heals our wounds, pouring into them His very blood as a remedy. In holy orders He communicates His own priestly office and character to some of the brethren. In matrimony He makes the human husband and wife to be the very image of Himself in His loving relation to the Church. Finally, in last anointing

and holy viaticum, He constitutes Himself the helper and conqueror of the soul in the supreme struggle at the hour of death.

Now, we must understand that all these personal favors lavished upon us by the Son of God are nothing else than His espousing of us unto Himself for time and eternity. All the other titles and offices which the Word of God made Man assumes in relation to us come finally to that one of His being our Heavenly Bridegroom. He is our King, our Shepherd, our Way, our good Samaritan, our Light, our Resurrection and Life; New Adam, Lord, the Lamb that was slain, the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the Conqueror that came to conquer, the Vine, the Vine-presser, our Propitiation, our Advocate, our Reconciliation, our Peace, our Joy, the Corner-stone and very Foundation of all the order of things, natural and supernatural; the Alpha and Omega of the world's history, as well as of every individual soul's history; our Companion on the way in the pilgrimage of life, the Morning Star, the Living Bread, the Sun, the Fountain, a Giant, a Friend, a Witness, High Priest, Altar and Victim, Bishop of our souls, Father of the world to come, Pontiff of the future bliss, Judge of the living and the dead, the eternal reward of the good and the eternal torment of the wicked—He is all that, and it all really comes to this one, exclusive relation of Himself with us, namely, that He is our Heavenly Bridegroom. His most precious Humanity in all its mysteries, from His Incarnation to His Death on the Cross, and from that to His last coming for Judgment, and in all its states, especially that of His Eucharistic Presence; His whole sacred Humanity, I say, is in a manner the sacrament, the sign, the sensible token and also the very means of our bridal union; but it is truly the Godhead of the Word, the eternal, infinite, glorious Son of God Who is the Bridegroom, whilst man, without distinction of sex (for here, "*caro non prodest quidquam*"), man who is by himself a weak and barren nature in regard to things heavenly, man is the bride of that divine marriage, which is not of the flesh, but of the spirit; man is the bride of that formidable Lover, the eternal Son of God! A very disproportionate match, indeed, but where an ineffable love fills the gap and levels the highest to the lowest and raises our nothingness to a share in His very sanctity and beauty and capacity for reciprocate love and eternal, divine life.

Our relation of sons to the Heavenly Father, full of divine sweetness as it is, is not unmixed with awe; we cannot allow ourselves to forget the infinite distance that separates our puny selves from the overwhelming majesty and sanctity of God. But with God the Son made Man, our relations are all entirely made up of sweetness

if only we will look at them under their true color. There is, or there ought to be, no feeling of awe between brother and brother; still less between the members of the body and their head; still less again, if possible, between the bride and her bridegroom. There ought to be between them only feelings of the most strong and tender and delicate mutual love. But in order to fully enter into such feelings, one needs to be greatly attentive to those sacred relations of oneself with the Son of God—one needs to be a mystic.

The Bridegroom is the Word of God; need we, then, insist on this particular and proper aspect of our marriage with Him, namely, that it is wholly spiritual and of the spirit? Whatever, therefore, is boldly borrowed in the *Canticle of Canticles* and other parts of Holy Writ, from the demonstrations of love as between a human bride and her human spouse, is to be interpreted wholly in a spiritual sense. The Son of God has already espoused to Himself the higher rational creatures, the blessed angels, and He is now bent upon espousing all men of good will. And it is the office of mystical life to make us attentive to that espousing of our soul by the Son of God and to excite us to render even now, whilst yet on earth, love for love to this, our Heavenly Bridegroom.

The wedding is begun on earth, to be consummated in heaven. It is during the present life that the two lovers, the Son of God and the Christian, plight their faith to one another, and the Bridegroom begins even now to take and to give kisses of love in the passing visits of Holy Communion. Holy Communion is not only the feeding of the divine child that the Christian is; it is, moreover, an act of his wedded life with Christ. It is on the part of the Son of God a taking possession of the body and soul of His little bride and a giving to her of her marital rights over Himself. "They will be two in one flesh" has been said of the husband and wife according to nature. At Holy Communion we are made one with Christ, so marvelously, so far beyond what poor human marriage can ever dream of! The Divine Bridegroom has placed His infinite power at the service of His love, so that we can say with absolute truth the words of the *Canticle of Canticles*: "My Beloved to me and I to Him, who feedeth among the lilies" (*Cant. xi., 16*). It is true the little bride cannot as yet see the face of her Beloved, nor feel His embrace all the time, though He is all the time near her in the Blessed Sacrament; she cannot at present see the Son of God in His majesty and loveliness and call Him "Husband" before all the angels and saints and the Heavenly Father; these things are not for our present condition of mortality—they are the privilege of the

coming eternity. Patience, patience! "Till the day break and the shadows retire" (Cant. ii., 17).

In the meanwhile, if we cannot enjoy our Heavenly Bridegroom to the full extent of our desire, we must at least be eager to embrace Him as often and as lovingly as we can in Holy Communion, under the veil of faith and of the sacred species, and we must employ the time of our exile in making ourselves more and more worthy of Him. Does not a king's bride try to adorn herself for him who will soon come and claim her for his wedded wife before all his court? Now that is precisely the work of the mystic life thus to adorn the soul, to enlarge her capacity of loving God more and more, to drill her in the good manners of the court of heaven, where she is so soon to appear as the bride and wedded wife of the King.

S. LOUISMET, O. S. B.

Buckfast Abbey, England.

FATHER ROBERT SOUTHWELL, S. J., POET AND MARTYR.

IF THE Pagan Renaissance had, as often has been claimed, a benign influence on the course of letters and the liberal arts generally, the age marked by the birth of the new literature witnessed in England a notable revival in two matters that are spiritually related—twin sisters, indeed, one may well regard them—Catholic faith and Catholic poetry. The Elizabethan era was particularly rich in poetical expression, though the terror of the penal enactments hung, like the sword of Damocles, suspended over the desk whereat the poet or the historian toiled secretly, by the light of the midnight oil, to keep alive the flame of the divine art and the light of the truth, for the benefit of its cause in succeeding generations. The great difficulty that the poets of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries found was not one of felicitous expression, but of happy repression—an outpouring of the laboring soul that, while not exactly destructive of the panting idea rising from the spark of Catholic inspiration, might yet divest it of such literary livery as was likely to lead the utterer to the Chamber of Little Ease or the embraces of her ladyship “the Scavenger’s Daughter,” in London Tower. The poetry is full of cryptic devices and mysterious allegories, fables with pointed meanings, anagrams, rebuses and puzzles—some as far-fetched as the Gold Beetle of Edgar Allan Poe’s “Tales of Mystery and Imagination.” The fashion of the age, among the “genus irritabile,” in seeking out patrons among the members of the nobility who were also aspirants after the bays, tended to the diligent cultivation of the enigmatic style in poetic vehicles, as the innumerable “dedications” to exalted personages, found in front of volumes of verse or new plays, abundantly testified. Because of the tendency of the bardic tribe to deal in the freemasonry of the occult, in order to keep up intercommunion, the poet and the *vates*, the prophet or the seer gifted with more than mundane book-lore, were frequently confounded—as in the case of “Virgil the Magician” and more particularly in that of Dante Alighieri, Tasso, and some other Italian poets of the Renaissance cycle. The appearance last year, amongst the Catholic Truth Society’s (England) of “The Triumphs Over Death,” by the Ven. Robert Southwell, S. J. (edited from the manuscripts by John William Trotman), introduces us to the “literary executor” of Father Southwell, John Trussell—a scholar and a poet whose literary remains exhibit some work that bears so extraordinary a resemblance

to works attributed to Shakespeare (in certain passages) that it is almost impossible to conceive that the resemblance is a mere literary coincidence; and so we have here a new element of surpassing interest added to the already perplexing tangle of the Shakespeare-Bacon controversy. Father Southwell's poetry and prose (which latter is prose only in form, and is really poetry of a truly sublime order as to matter, and as to manner is elegant in the extreme) appear to have been put into manuscript form during a period when the writer was in hiding, going about in disguises and under assumed names, and all the time ministering to the spiritual wants of many persons who braved the fearful punishments prescribed by the law for such as dared to harbor or succor ecclesiastics of the Catholic faith. How any man could, under such conditions, sit down to compose poetry, is difficult, truly, to realize. The poetry, too, that was produced under such haphazard rumagate circumstances, is of so great nicety of construction as to have demanded much time in the selection of phrases to give it scholastic finish and literary polish.

Some students of Father Southwell's works hazarded the suggestion that he might have composed some of it in prison, but that seems preposterous. His brutal treatment while under durance must have been effected to strangle all desire for poetical expression—all physical ability, in fact, to think methodically or in poetical order. The tortures inflicted on him by the monster Topcliffe were the most fiendish that a devilish heart could conceive.

The author of this biography of Father Southwell gives a very curious fact in relation to his education—one that invests his poetical work with a very rare value. He tells how having been sent to Douai, from Horsham in Norfolk, to be educated "when very young," he, in his fifteenth year, passed over to Paris, and in his seventeenth to Rome, to enter the Society of Jesus, on his novitiate. At this time he took the opportunity of studying his mother tongue—a fact which shows that he was a mere child when first sent abroad, and so had lost all recollection of the few words he had been taught to lip in his infancy. To study the English language so diligently as to be able to compose the quaintest of poetry in it must have demanded several years of close reading of the best authors in the language. This, besides the other studies which were included in the Jesuit course, gives an indication of the great grasp of the author's intellect and his consuming anxiety to master all the tasks he had mapped out for his course in life. The exact date of his birth is not known; his biographer says it was in or at about the year 1561.

Father Southwell was ordained to the priesthood in 1584. Two

years after, accompanied by Father Henry Garnett, he went to England, having been assigned to that perilous duty by his superiors. He knew that it meant death, preceded by torture, if captured; but this had no terrors for him. To be a martyr was the summit of his noble ambition, yet to adopt every means possible to defer the date so long as he could save souls meanwhile. Of his power to win souls by the magic of his eloquence, the Jesuit Provincial in England, Father Foley, forty years after his martyrdom, wrote: "A man of high position died this year. He had once heard Father Robert Southwell preach a sermon, full of divine fervor, in which he had earnestly excited the souls of young men to the pursuit of a virtuous life. He often related to some of his friends that this sermon was regarded as miraculous, the face of the preacher, then advanced in life, appearing radiant with light, and his head as though surrounded by bright rays. From that time forward this gentleman became a totally changed man."

Father Southwell was done to death in 1595. He was not "advanced in life," in the usual sense of that phrase, even when death came to end his torments. But the hardships he had undergone and the privations he had to go through, while he was in hiding, had, doubtless, preyed upon his frame and countenance and made him look aged before he had in fact outgrown the period of youth.

"The methods used by Topcliffe, the priest-hunter," says Professor Cheyney, of the University of Pennsylvania, "were so abominable that his name has found its way into many Latin manuscripts of the time as a verb, 'topcliffizare,' which expresses the most abominable crime." The treatment accorded to Catholics during Elizabeth's reign, says the same eminent authority, "is one of the saddest and cruelest in history outside the times of the early persecutions." When prisoners were subjected to torture, the law decreed that a magistrate should be present to see that too much severity was not resorted to. In this case Topcliffe had gone to the Queen and asked her permission to torture him privately, and the permission was graciously granted. What the victim experienced at the hands of the inhuman villain it is not in the power of words to tell, so devilish was his ingenuity in the infliction of exquisite physical pain.

The author of this interesting little biography of the heroic martyr says:

"From the moment (if not earlier) in which he as a youth entered the Society of Jesus his life was as completely offered to his Divine Master as that of St. Ignatius of Loyola or St. Francis Xavier, and although his sphere of labor differed from theirs, the fire of Divine Love, the thirst for the salvation of souls and the

ardent longing for martyrdom burned in his breast as hotly as in theirs; the fragmentary outpourings of his soul which have survived are sufficient evidence of this, and if, against almost incredible odds, he escaped for six years the diabolical schemes of the persecutors to capture him, the fact is attributable to his prudent determination to spend himself, as long as Divine Providence should permit, in the service of the persecuted Catholics, and not to any fear of the barbarous cruelty which he knew well would be the inevitable sequel to his capture; in fact, his chief fear, manifested in his letters which have come down to us, was that he might prove unworthy of the martyr's crown."

On pp. 99-101 is presented a considerable portion of the account of his martyrdom written by Father Garnett to the General of the Jesuits in Rome, Father Claud Aquaviva, translated from the original in Stonyhurst College. The date is March 4, 1595. It is as follows:

"London, February 22, 1594, O. S.

"March 4, 1595, N. S.

"The peace of Christ Jesus. At length I have a most beautiful flower to offer to your paternity from your garden, a most sweet fruit from your tree, an admirable treasure from your treasury, 'silver tried by the fire, purged from the earth, refined seven times.' It is Christ's unconquered soldier, most faithful disciple, most valiant martyr, Robert Southwell, formerly my dearest companion and brother, now my lord, patron and king, reigning with Christ.

"He had been kept for nearly three years in closer custody than any one ever was, so that no Catholic ever saw him or spoke to him. He was often tortured and that in a more cruel manner than even this barbarity is accustomed to inflict. He publicly declared that he had been tortured ten times, and that with torments worse than the rack or than death itself.

"Thus deprived of all human aid, at length they brought him forth that it might be clear to all how far the divine assistance exceeds all human help.

"For all this long time he could neither say Mass, nor go to the Sacrament of Penance, nor speak with any one, nor receive consolation from any; yet he went to judgment and to execution with so calm and tranquil a mind that you would have said that he came from the midst of a monastery of religious men, and that he was passing of his own free accord from the breasts of his mother to the sweetest of delights.

"He was taken from the Tower of London to Newgate, the prison for thieves and murderers, and there he was kept for three days in

what they call *Limbo*, with no comfort but a candle. On February 20 he was brought into court, where by a cunning device his adversaries took care that very few people should be present; for the day before they gave no notice of what they were going to do, either to the gaoler or to any one else; and at the very time he was summoned a notable thief was led off to execution, which was done that almost all the city might be drawn to see him and thus not notice what was done with the Father."

The chief subject treated in the prose poem, "The Triumphs Over Death," is the life and virtues of the Lady Margaret Howard, and it is addressed to her brother Philip, Earl of Arundel, respectively daughter and son of Thomas, third Duke of Norfolk. It is literally a noble string of rarest gems of thought—a rosary of sweet consolations to the mourning souls for whose benefit it was strung together by a magic hand. It winds up with four stanzas, of six lines each, in regular poetic metre. They are as follows:

"Of Howard's stem a glorious branch is dead;
Sweet lights eclipsed were in her decease;
In Buckhurst's line she glorious issue spread,
She heaven with two, with four did earth increase;
Fame, honor, grace, gave air unto her breath;
Rest, glory, joys, were sequels of her death.

"Death aimed too high, he hit too choice a wight,
Renowned for birth, for life, for lovely parts;
He killed her cares, he brought her worth to light,
He robbed our eyes, but hath enriched our hearts;
He let out of the ark a Noe's dove,
But many hearts are arks unto her love.

"Grace, nature, fortune, did in her conspire
To show a proof of their united skill;
Sly fortune, ever false, did soon retire,
But doubled grace supplied false fortune's ill;
And though she raught not to her fortune's pitch,
In grace and nature few were found so rich.

"Heaven of this heavenly pearl is now possest,
Whose lustre was the blaze of honor's light;
Whose substance pure of every good the best,
Whose price the crown of virtue's highest right;
Whose praise to be herself, whose greatest bliss—
To live, to love, to be, where now she is."

Of John Trussell, the "literary executor of the poet martyr," the author of the biography tells us a good deal. He says:

"A careful study of his verses (allowing for possible *errata*, to amend which we have no manuscript) reveals a writer of pronounced personality. In the same year they were written (1595) was printed a poem which he had composed in his youth and which he terms his *Primitiæ*; this is *Raptus I Helenæ, or the First Rape of Fair Helen*; there is only one copy of the work known; it is in a private collection and by the courtesy of the owner I was permitted to transcribe it. It is a work stamped with a genius of so high and original a character that were it advanced as the first-fruits of Shakespeare's own muse, composed in his youth (and such indeed I personally suspect it to be), I doubt if any competent critic would find difficulty in accepting it as such; for it is no less Shakespearean than *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*, and in some respects markedly resembles *A Lover's Complaint*; in fact, it is no exaggeration to say that in *Helen* we have in the bud all those features which characterize the flower of Shakespeare's genius; it is brilliant in invention and perfectly sweet in versification, although, as one of the prefatory stanzas has it, the subject is 'indeed a toy, such as the gravest wits regard not much.'"

The facts which the author of this biography has carefully collected and placed in juxtaposition with others relative to the Shakespeare-Bacon controversy, project some new lights upon the screen. Both Father Southwell and his devoted friend, John Trussell, were enthusiastic wooers of the Muse—Southwell furtively, by reason of his priestly calling, but boldly enough; Trussell as soon as he had felt his pinions' strength. Mr. Trotman has made diligent search for evidence of his personality and literary qualifications.

Some idea of the lines of argument on which the martyr poet relied to point his idea of triumph over death is to be gained by a reproduction of a few verses of the prose-poetry, as follows:

"In Paradise we received the sentence of death (Genesis 5), and here as prisoners we are kept in ward, tarrying but our turns till the gaoler calls us to our execution.

"Whom hath any virtue eternized, or desert commended to posterity, that hath not mourned in life and been mourned after death? no assurance of joy being sealed without some tears.

"Even our Blessed Lady, the Mother of God, was thrown down as deep in temporal miseries as she was advanced high in spiritual honors; none amongst all mortal creatures finding in life more proofs than she of her mortality. For having the noblest Son that

ever woman was mother of, not only above the conditions of men, but above the glory of angels: being her Son only, without temporal father, and thereby the love of both parents doubled in her breast: being her only Son without other issue, and so her love of all children finished in Him: yea, He being God and she the nearest creature to God's perfections, yet no prerogative acquitted either her from mourning or Him from dying.

"And though they surmounted the highest angels in all other preëminence, yet were they equal with the meanest men in the sentence of death. And howbeit our Lady, being the pattern of Christian mourners, so tempered her anguish that there was neither anything undone that might be disliked in so perfect a matron; yet by this we may guess with what courtesy death is likely to friend us, that durst cause so bloody funerals in so heavenly a stock: not exempting Him from the law of dying that was the Author of life, and soon after to honor His triumph with the ruins and spoils of death.

"Seeing therefore that death spareth none, let us spare our tears for the better uses; being but an idle sacrifice to this deaf and implacable executioner and, for this, not long to be continued where they can never profit."

The difficulties and doubts which had been started in the course of the Bacon *vel* Shakespeare controversy are immensely increased by the theories and reasons put forward in Father Trussell's contributions, written and printed, to the bewildering problems. We are confronted by two bold leading suggestions—one, that Father Southwell wrote many things attributed to William Shakespeare; the other, that John Trussell, the biographer of Father Southwell, wrote several things which resemble things attributed to Shakespeare so closely that it is hard somehow to avoid the conclusion that there was bold plagiarism on the one side or the other, unless we accept the solution offered by Mr. Trotman's theory. As to Trussell's personality, Mr. Trotman says:

"John Trussell sprang from an ancient and honorable family resident for centuries at Billesley, near Stratford-on-Avon. Mrs. Stopes (the recognized authority on the Shakespeare genealogy) is of opinion that Shakespeare's maternal grandmother (Mary Arden's mother) was a Miss Trussell; my personal information does not warrant the expression of an opinion and, to speak truly, I make no profession of having investigated any pedigrees.

"Trussell speaks of London as his 'mother' and Camden as his 'schoolmaster'; he also speaks of Fabyan the Chronicler, who preceded him by a century, as his 'brother'; such terms are here poetic.

and if the reader will remember that Father Southwell is a poet, his use of the term 'cousin,' occurring in this volume, will be understood (especially by a reference to 'Measure for Measure,' Act I., Scene 5) as certainly indicating very close friendship, but not necessarily blood relationship.

"It would occupy too much space here to review at length Trussell's manuscripts; in sum he defends the old religion and bewails the devastation caused by that rebellion which has been falsely termed a 'Reformation;' in this respect, as in all other, his sentiments are those of Shakespeare.

"He defends the credibility of ancient British history, handed down orally by the Druids, from which Shakespeare draws (with no suspicion of skepticism) his *King Lear* and *Cymbeline*.

"I have already given verses from his earliest work, *Helen*, in respect of which attention is now invited to these lines:

'I'll take advantage of each idle time
Till I shall please you with more pleasing rhyme,'

which may be compared with the following from the dedication of *Venus and Adonis*:

"'And vow to take advantage of all idle hours till I have honored you with some graver labor.'

"But over half a century later this curious coincidence occurs: John Trussell commences his manuscript dedication thus:

"'Howsoever two of the four props which I had prepared to support by their authority the weak fabric of this my *Touchstone of Antiquity*, etc.

"Which may be compared with the dedication of *Venus and Adonis*:

"'I know not . . . how the world will censure me for choosing so strong a prop to support so weak a burden.'

"Interest is added to the parallelism by the fact that *Venus and Adonis* is dedicated to Henry Wriothesly, third Earl of Southampton, and Thomas Wriothesly, fourth Earl, is one of Trussell's four 'props.'"

"Reverting now to his connection with Father Southwell, it is remarkable that in editions of the *Triumphs* subsequent to that of 1596 (i. e., 1620, 1630 and 1634) only the first of the three sets of prefatory verses occurs John Trussell's name disappears entirely and is replaced with the initials 'S. W.' A letter which prefixes Southwell's *St. Peter's Complaint* (first printed in 1595) is addressed to 'his loving cousin, Mr. W. S.' In the letter printed in this present volume his cousin is 'W. R.'

"I suggest that 'W. S.,' 'S. W.' and 'W. R.' all stand for one name; that is, William Shakespeare, and that it was John Trussell who borrowed that name to conceal his own identity; I further surmise that Father Southwell's soliloquy herein printed concerns the same person. I think it scarcely possible for any one free from prepossessions to thoroughly study the works of Shakespeare and not conclude, solely upon internal evidence, that the author was a Catholic; such a conclusion, at least on the part of those conversant with contemporary Catholic conditions and literature, renders it not only probable, but morally certain that the author would protect himself by the use of a pseudonym; and it is not unreasonable that he should have adopted the name of the one who was to be his mouthpiece and was a member of a privileged profession.

"Such a position I make no pretense to prove, but surely it is a reasonable hypothesis, the grounds of which I now give to augment the remarkable resemblance between Shakespeare and Trussell.

"Southwell's letter to 'Mr. W. S.' (which we see in all, but particularly the 1616 and 1620 editions of *St. Peter's Complaint*) makes clear the following facts: 'W. S.' was a poet who had 'importuned' Southwell to write poems; Southwell complied, but only to the extent of, to use his own words, 'laying a few coarse threads together, to invite some skilfuller wits to go forward in the same, or to begin some finer piece.' These he sends to 'W. S.' with these words: 'I send you these few ditties; add you the tunes, and let the mean, I pray you, be still a part in all your music,' and telling him that 'he must bear part of the penance when it shall please sharp censures to impose it.'

"In these simple facts lies, I beg humbly to advance, an intelligible explanation of most of Shakespeare's Sonnets, of which no rational interpretation has hitherto been given; I mean that the ideal personality around which so many of the Sonnets are written is in reality that of Father Southwell."

Many a mind fruitful in conjecture, and delighting in elusive literary problems, has found keen enjoyment in the quest of the seemingly inscrutable and undiscoverable. The secrets they would fain penetrate may never be disclosed, at least by guesswork. But at all events their efforts are deserving of credit for their sincerity of purpose and the earnestness of their zeal in the course of historical truth.

(The work has been published here by B. Herder, St. Louis; price, 30 cents.)

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

RAMBLES NEAR NAPLES—THE WONDERS OF POZZUOLI.

WHEN I was awakened by the sound of singing in different parts of the city, and on going to my window saw the houses in Capri gleaming in the sun twenty miles across the bay, the demon of travel within me told the demon of sloth that we should make a day of it and visit Little Vesuvius and sights of the western coast of the Bay of Naples. On a previous occasion I had already gone as far as Posilippo and enjoyed the view for hours together of Naples and Vesuvius and far-extending Sorrento; had lingered among the fisherfolk till evening's maternal hand had extended the warm cloak of rusty brown over the smoking mountain.

On this second occasion, however, it was my intention to leave Posilippo, on my left, and cut through the famous old grotto, nearly two-thirds of a mile long, that shortens the traveler's journey in the Bagnuoli and Pozzuoli direction. Bagnuoli, as the name implies, is famous for its baths, for the country hereabout is broken on every side with sulphur springs; otherwise the place is small and of little account, though blessed with a most magnificent panorama of the bay, with the islands of Nisida, Procida and Ischia. At the time of my visit the town of Ischia had suffered greatly from rain, half the town being destroyed. On the same occasion Salerno had been completely wrecked, whilst Amalfi had not entirely escaped. Naples itself was shaken with earthquakes, and at one point during a day's outing I found progress impossible, as a whole hillside had fallen away and carried the road along with it. So many disasters had occurred that the "cocchiere" who was driving me did not know of this accident, although I hired him at his stand within a quarter of a mile of the scene. Bagnuoli paid its share, too, for at one point the road had been partly washed into the sea and road-car traveling was somewhat precarious. The baths in this place are sovereign for the cure of skin diseases—not uncommon in Italy. Having no particular reason to delay in Bagnuoli, I went on to the far more interesting town of Pozzuoli (ancient Puteoli). Both names are connected with the Latin "puteal," a well, reference, no doubt, to the existence of springs similar to those found at Bagnuoli.

The first object of striking interest in this ancient town is the crater of La Solfatara; this overhangs the town, and in 1198 it overwhelmed the place in a great eruption. A guide had offered his services in the piazza, and a carriage was procured to scale the steep road, still showing many remains of ancient Roman pavement. In a short time the volcano was reached—not before the guide had

purchased two torches of brimstone, and, with the moon already peeping through the waning daylight, we began our exploration of the crater—an area about a quarter of a mile in diameter.” *Quà, quà,*” the guide would say; “follow me lest you fall into the *spiragli*.” His caution was needed, for in several directions the *spiragli*, or vent-holes, were to be seen fuming and boiling around us. A fall was by no means desirable even to contemplate. “Here is one,” said the guide, “that has appeared only this month.” He stood on the edge and held me as I looked over. Below us, roaring and tumbling, the earth seethed and hissed like so much water, only water could not stand this temperature, for this heaving earth was registering the rather alarming heat of over 3,000 degrees Fahrenheit. When the guide sprinkled molten brimstone from his torches upon the tossing fluid, then indeed did the crater show its fury, the smoke ascending in dense volumes over our heads. We repeated the experiment at several of the *spiragli*. A ragged boy appeared from a hut nearby and asked an alms. Having made an end of our experiments, to the great satisfaction of one of us at least, we returned across the quaking surface of the crater, which is of a creamy color. It is from here that the Italians obtain much of their beautiful stucco for decorating their buildings.

Near the crater is the amphitheatre in which St. Januarius (patron saint of Naples) and his companions were exposed to wild beasts; but the beasts left them unharmed, though previously kept fasting to make them more fierce. This theatre held 35,000 spectators; it contained conduits for filling the arena with water for the purpose of representing naval battles. To return to St. Januarius. When his captors were disappointed in the amphitheatre, they took him out and beheaded him. There is a stone preserved on which some of his blood fell. This stone is in the Church of San Gennaro (Januarius), erected on the very scene of his martyrdom. The curious point is this: When the blood of St. Januarius liquefies in Naples Cathedral (which happens regularly thrice a year, and usually before any great calamity, such as an eruption of Vesuvius), the blood on this stone at Pazzuoli also liquefies. I have not had the opportunity of witnessing this liquefaction here, but saw a similar marvel in Rome. In the Church of the Twelve Apostles at Rome the blood of St. James (the Less, I think) is shown in a permanently liquid state. There is no deception. The blood is in the bottom of a small beaker, or vial, and can be examined within six inches of the eye under a bright electric bulb. Only once a year (feast of the Twelve Apostles) is this treasure shown.

On our way down from the crater we paid a visit to another of

the surprises of Pazzuoli—the famous Temple of Serapis. What we now see—a few columns of *cippolino*—is but a faint reminder of the greatness of this vast and beautiful edifice, with its sixty-four immense columns. The beauty of the building is faded; its interest now lies in the extraordinary record it has preserved for us of the periodical rising and falling of the Neapolitan coast. A learned professor in Germany has measured the tide that rolls across the land just as the tide sweeps over the sea. But this is not the phenomenon that distinguishes Pozzuoli. Here the land continues steadily to rise for a period of centuries to a height of some six feet, and then falls again. You can see the columns discolored to about that height, and on close examination you can see barnacles embedded in the *cippolino*, showing that the sea once reached that level. Even today the floor of the temple is covered by the tide, and the guide procures a long iron rod, with which he strikes, through the water, upon the marble pavement of the building.

It was now late in the evening when Tonino and myself ended our ramble. He was an agreeable fellow. To crown the day's outing he led me to an *osteria*, where Falernian wine was obtainable. This wine, he explained, was got not from Horace's own farm, but from the one next to it. We shared a bottle, and strong stuff it was—a common feature of these South Italian wines. Tonino acquitted himself nobly and swore everlasting service, and I have no doubt he meant it, for a more gentlemanly guide it was never my fortune to meet. As we parted he pointed to the Bay of Baiae and recalled to me how that most clownish (and most cruel) of Roman Emperors, Caligula, had a causeway laid across the bay, from Puteoli to Baiae, a distance of nearly two miles, merely to be able to dash across it once on his chariot and thus say that he was able, like Neptune, to ride upon the waters. We shall speak no more of Baiae for the present; that luxurious region, together with Lake Avernus, the New Mountain, Cumae and other places of ancient story were the objects of another visit and demand a separate treatment.

CHRISTOPHER FLYNN.

Youghal, Ireland.

IRELAND'S SUSPENDED RIGHT.

HERE are Argus-eyed coteries of persons, both in the United States and the British Islands, whose wish is father to the thought, going about declaring boldly that "Home Rule is dead" and, consequently, that all the labors of the men who maintained the struggle to gain it, and all the money subscribed to maintain a loyal party continuously in Parliament to advocate and defend it, and outmanœuvre the machinations of its bitter foes in both Houses of the British Parliament, have been utterly wasted and barren of result. It requires no little nerve to put forward such a proposition in face of the facts which the chroniclers of the doings in Parliament and of the public proceedings all over the British Isles, having relation to this supremely paramount question, have written in the annals of the time. But the persons who have undertaken the task are not of the timid or overscrupulous kind. The actual situation, as regards the Home Rule Act and the Welsh Church Disestablishment Act, is similar. These Acts, though they have received the royal assent and been signed by the King, are in a state of suspended animation, waiting for the termination of the war to become active law. In the case of the Irish Act, the function of putting an Amending Act, making certain exemptions with regard to Ulster for a period of six years after the passing of the Act, remains to be gone through ere it can be finally put as a completed enactment on the statute books of the realm.

It is an odious chapter of Anglo-Irish history that will have to be told regarding what the enemies of justice to Ireland resorted to in order to frustrate the understanding between the Ministry and the Irish Nationalist party and defeat the legislature of the Houses of Parliament providing for the establishment of a Parliament in Dublin for the regulation of Irish affairs. A military conspiracy to effect this purpose was discovered, and the guilt of its ringleaders was admitted, yet none of them was prosecuted for the treason or punished in any adequate way. The outbreak of the European war rendered it advisable to pursue a policy of forbearance in the face of the larger danger. Even the most active and irreconcilable of the plotters and disturbers, Sir Edward Carson, the leader of the Orange hosts in Ulster, was rewarded with almost the highest place in the Coalition Ministry which the Government found it advisable to recommend to the King as a means of uniting all parties and all sections of the population in defense of the territories and possessions of the Empire. The irreconcilable section in Ireland has been making an attempt to discredit Mr. Redmond's leadership because

of the suspension of the Home Rule Act, but he has received the hearty support of the hierarchy and clergy who have helped the people to win the fight for Home Rule and the great boon of the Land Act, by means of which about three-fourths of the soil of the country has been transferred, by a system of peaceful purchase on the installment plan, from the old race of landlords to its present tillers, the tenants. One of the great pillars of the Irish party, the Right Rev. Dr. O'Donnell, Bishop of Raphoe, honorary treasurer for many years of the National fund, has come forward to the defense of the Irish leader and the party in a most interesting and enlightening letter on the whole situation. The letter is of so important a character as to possess much more than an insular interest; it is of world-wide interest, considering the omnipresent character of the Irish emigration, so that it is a matter of historical duty to give it as much publicity as possible. It was written by the Bishop with reference to the recent Convention in County Donegal. The principal portions are as follow:

"Any disposition to belittle the Act or the Party is altogether out of place. When one considers the obstacles in the way of the Home Rule Bill, the wonder is that it was got through at all.

"The achievement of overcoming the veto of the House of Lords removed an almost insuperable barrier. But, as you well know, the resistance to Home Rule of an important section of the Irish people was supported by one of the great English parties, was backed by society in England, and not discouraged, to say the least of it, by the army officers in Ireland.

"Had the Irish leaders to reckon only with the Liberal Party in the stages that led up to the Home Rule Act, Mr. Redmond could have shown any amount of independence. But, in face of powerful opposition on all sides, strong men of sense make allowance for the difficulties of their supporters, and, for the sake of the cause, if from no other motive, will be slow to slay their allies, even if some few of them seem to deserve political execution. Then, when we recall such things as the marvelous effort by which the late Administration was kept in being, after the Curragh mutiny, to pass Home Rule, it is only justice to say that the Irish Party is not the only party that did splendid work in advancing the Bill to the Statute Book.

"I have been told that since the beginning of this dreadful war, in which so many brave men from both sides of the Channel stand and fall together, a happy change has come over the views of large numbers of Conservatives, who, from honest conviction or by reason of hereditary attitude, had been no friends of Irish Nationality.

But, to this day, though the brave Irish regiments have been in the most perilous undertakings since the war began, and have suffered accordingly, the dispatches from the front manage to waste no breath in trumpeting home the praises of Irish valor as displayed by any body of Irish troops.

"It would be well for Ireland and well for England if the Home Rule Act had been in operation before the war. The response to Mr. Redmond's appeal would then be far heartier, good as that response is now; and Ireland could put her case much more effectively, when the load of war taxation is being adjusted, both from the point of view of relative taxable capacity and of the enormous advantages resulting to Great Britain from the success of the Allies. I would much prefer forty-two Irish members at Westminster and a Parliament sitting in Dublin, for this purpose, to 103 members at Westminster without an Irish Parliament. The Act, however, rightly provides for a special Irish representation at Westminster, when, after the disappearance of the deficit, the taxation powers of the Irish Parliament are being extended in view of a contribution from Ireland to the common expenditure of the United Kingdom.

"The prospect of these increased powers, according to the provisions of the Act itself, is now no longer remote; and the wider the general authority of the Irish Parliament the better for both countries. But, in my opinion, the limit placed on taxation powers in the Act, however distasteful to us, is not a serious impediment to the work of the Irish Parliament these years. The restrictions, introduced to allay groundless fears on the part of our Unionist neighbors, might indeed conceivably hamper them and us in some great public project; and the best form of Amending Bill Ulstermen could seek would be one to remove all unnecessary restrictions from the measure. However, even in regard to these matters, I have no misgiving about the capacity of the whole Irish people, North and South, to solve such difficulties as might arise in working the Act.

"An Irish Parliament under the Act, as it stands, would deserve and command respect, and prove an efficient instrument of National regeneration. In its own sphere its proceedings are not subject to review by any other body. Last autumn something was done to enlarge the surplus at its disposal; and the structure of the financial arrangement between Ireland and Great Britain, under the Act, has solid soundness in it beyond anything previously proposed. The Act might, of course, be better. If Irish Unionists desire an Amending Bill, it should be to help and not to hinder their native land and themselves. But the Act, as we have it, is a great measure, even for its high purpose. It gives Ireland, as the finest fruit of the

Irish National movement in our day, the best Constitution ever recognized here by England since the English connection began."

This is a complete answer to the factional cavilers at home whom nothing that mortal man could do would satisfy, if not done at their dictation. As for the cavilers on this side of the ocean, they are hardly worth considering seriously, since they are of the class who are always at war with what recognized governments do in any part of the world.

The appearance of the following notice in the British press has once more set in motion the tongues of those who give out the exulting threnody over the pretended death of the Home Rule Act:

"An order in Council under the Suspensory Act, 1914, has been gazetted, making the following provision regarding the Government of Ireland and the Welsh Church Acts, 1914:

"If at the expiration of twelve months from the date of the passing of the said Acts the present war is not ended—

"1. No steps shall be taken to put the Government of Ireland Act, 1914, into operation until the expiration of eighteen months from the date of the passing of that Act unless the present war has previously ended, nor if at the expiration of those eighteen months the present war has not ended, until such later date, not being later than the end of the present war, as may hereafter be fixed by order in Council.

"2. The date of disestablishment under the Welsh Church Act, 1914, shall be postponed until the end of the present war.

"In the House of Lords Lord St. Aldwyn drew attention to the indefiniteness of the words 'until the end of the war,' and Lord Crewe said he would consult with his colleagues with a view to arriving at some final definition of this somewhat obscure phrase, as he called it, which appeared in various Acts of Parliament."

There is nothing of fresh significance in the appearance of these notifications in the public press. It is now more than a year since they were officially signed; and if the war were to come to an end to-morrow, that fact would not affect the arrangement as to the eighteen months' delay agreed upon by the Government and the Parliament. Everything that human foresight could suggest to render the international agreement as to the initiation of the system of Home Rule binding and final has been done, as well as the extraordinary conditions that arose to interrupt its passage to finality would permit.

The declarations of Mr. John E. Redmond, the leader of the Irish Parliamentary party, on this subject are emphatic and incontrovertible. They were given out at a Convention in Waterford on the

23d of August last. Mr. Redmond declared that there need be no fears of the effect of an Amending Bill. The coming into operation of the Home Rule Act at the end of the war, if not before it, is automatic. Nothing can prevent the Act coming into operation. "If the Home Rule Act is not in operation at the end of the war, then under this statute it automatically comes into operation at the very moment," said Mr. Redmond. The Home Rule Act is on the Statute Book; it is a part of the Constitution of Great Britain. Nothing can displace it, nor can it be varied without the consent of the Irish people and their leaders.

These statements of fact and opinion from the legitimate authority ought to suffice to silence the voice of captious criticism.

SPES.

Book Reviews

POPULAR SERMONS ON THE CATHECHISM. Bamberg-Thurston. Vol. III.: The Sacraments. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This volume completes Father Bamberg's Popular Sermons on the Catechism. The first volume treated of the twelve articles of the Apostles' Creed; the second dealt with the Commandments, and this one explains the Sacraments.

The two former volumes won universal high praise from the critics, and this volume merits equally high commendation. The author seems to speak even on the printed page, and whether his sermons are read by the people for their own instruction or preached by their pastor for their enlightenment, Father Bamberg will be the teacher. His sermons are so comprehensive, so clear, so aptly illustrated, so logical, that the lesson is always taught effectually, and the conclusion is irresistibly reached. They are the kind of sermons that can be preached just as they are. They will suit any audience, in any place, at any time.

This can be illustrated best by quoting one of them in full, and for this purpose we shall take the first one in the book, and on the most difficult subject—

ACTUAL GRACE.

"Having considered the first two important parts of the catechism which deals with the twelve articles of the Apostles' Creed and with the Commandments, we come now to the third part, which gives us an explanation of grace and the means of grace.

"We need the help of God's grace, not only that we may believe what He has revealed, but also to enable us to keep His Commandments in such a way as to attain salvation.

"The catechism asks, 'What do you mean by grace?' And it answers, 'By grace I mean a supernatural gift of God bestowed upon us through the merits of Jesus Christ for our salvation.' Briefly, grace is a gift, a present from God to man; He gives it to each one of us to show us the way to salvation, to help us to walk in it, and so lead us to heaven. It is Jesus Christ Who has earned these graces for us as the fruits of His Passion and Death. Grace is in nature interior and supernatural. It is interior. The word

'gift' generally conveys to us the idea of something visible and material, but grace is entirely interior and spiritual, and is communicated by God to the soul. It is supernatural. This means that it does not form part of our human nature and is not inherent in any of man's natural power; it cannot be deserved or obtained by any human effort, for it is a precious thing, a priceless gift from the Hand of God, which is won by the Blood of Jesus Christ and which leads us to life everlasting.

"There are several kinds of grace. The most important are actual grace and sanctifying grace.

"How are these two kinds of grace to be distinguished? Tell me first how we should distinguish two trees, similar in size and shape, one from another? We should look out for differences in their respective fruits and blossom in the shape of their leaves, in their wood, bark and even in their roots. We should insist not perhaps upon their most important point of dissimilarity, but upon that which was most striking. Let us now in this case inquire which is the most apparent and obvious point of difference between actual grace and sanctifying grace. It lies in their duration. Actual grace passes away: it may remain with us for a longer or a shorter time, but it will leave us just as flashes of lightning appear only to disappear again. But sanctifying or habitual grace is permanent in its nature; it dwells in the soul always unless banished by mortal sin. It is like the sun, which will shine in the firmament and give forth light until extinguished by the Hand of God.

"Now that we have prepared the way by these remarks, let us get to work and examine more closely that grace which we call actual grace. Here are four questions to which, with the help of the Holy Ghost, we must find the answer:

"1. In what does actual grace consist?

"2. How far is it necessary to us?

"3. To whom is it given?

"4. What are its effects?

"1. The catechism asks, 'What is actual grace?'

"The answer is, 'Actual grace is that help of God which enlightens our mind and moves our will to shun evil and to do good.' In other words, it is the influence of God on the powers of our soul.

Inanimate things act in different ways upon one another; for instance, the action of the sun on all earthly and even heavenly bodies is considerable; human bodies, too, can be affected by air, water, their place of habitation, their clothing, their food; we ourselves act upon material objects, lifting and carrying them with our hands, destroying, distributing, molding and disposing of them according to our fancy.

“One man has power to influence another by means of instruction—commands, warnings, threats, promises or by his example in word or deed. We can see, therefore, that creatures influence each other in numberless ways, but God’s actions exercise an influence of a peculiarly strong and powerful nature over all His creatures. No sparrow can fall to the ground nor a hair from our head unless He wills it; He preserves all His creatures, guiding their whole existence, their life and all their actions. Such is the influence of God upon the things of nature; but He also exerts a supernatural action upon the powers of our souls. What are these powers? Just as our body has two arms and hands with which to do its work, so the soul is possessed of two arms and hands, as it were, by means of which all its operations are accomplished. They are understanding and free will. How does God act upon these powers? First, He enlightens our understanding. The understanding may be described as the eyesight of the soul, and sight, we know, is useless in the dark. We assist our eyes by bringing a light near them or by lighting up the object we wish to look at, or we straighten our sight with spectacles or with a microscope or a telescope. Therefore, when God wishes to help our understanding, He enlightens it so that we may see things which were before unseen and recognize what otherwise would remain shrouded in darkness; then the purpose for which we were created and the road by which we may travel to our goal becomes plain to us; the value of good works, the virtue of suffering, the danger of temptation, the power of prayer, the horror of sin, are made clearly apparent. Try to imagine a prisoner lying in chains in a dark dungeon; the door of his prison is wide open, but he cannot see it. Suddenly a flash of lightning illuminates the whole place, revealing to him for the first time a means of escape. Hope springs up within him and, rising, he gropes his way to the door as best he can.

"How does God work upon the will? By inclining it to avoid evil and to do good. As all material objects have a tendency to fall to the earth, so the will of man is inclined toward evil from his childhood; and just as the lifeless object lying on the earth is inert and incapable of raising itself, so also is our will incapable by itself of desiring and striving after our supernatural good. How, then, is it to be moved? Material objects are moved by being drawn by some exterior force, so by the grace of God is our will lifted up and moved to do good and to avoid evil. A dead stone can be thrown to a great height by the strength of a boy's arm, and a projectile can be projected an enormous distance by some of the latest guns; but still more wonderful is the power of the grace of God on our weak human will. Think again for a moment of that prisoner in his dungeon. The first flash of lightning showed him the way out, but heavy chains still bind him to the wall. Suppose another flash of lightning were to come and shatter the iron chain, how quickly would he then rush to free himself from his state of captivity! The first lightning flash enabled his eyes to see the way out; the second destroyed his chains and gave him power to move. This is exactly what actual grace does for us—it enlightens our understanding and moves our will to do good and to avoid evil. For the present let this suffice, but later on we shall divide actual graces into those which enlighten the understanding and those which move and work upon the will."

Space will not permit further quotation, but this will suffice to show the excellence of the work.

THE HEART OF A MAN. By Richard Aumerle Maher. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This story first appeared serially in the "Ecclesiastical Review" under the title "Socialism or Faith." We think the original title the more fitting, because it describes the story better. The hero is tempted to give up his faith for Socialism, because he thinks faith does not solve social problems nor right social wrongs, as he believes it should, and because he thinks Socialism will do these things. The whole story hinges on this struggle, and on the triumph of faith.

Of course, the second title is more appealing to the multitude, and will attract the attention of the larger number. Besides, it announces a story and not an economic discussion, as the former title seems to do.

But as the book is really a combination of both, would it not have been better to keep both titles?

It is a story of a condition and a conflict, all too common throughout the world, but especially in this country. The scene is laid in a mill town, where everything turns around and depends on one industry.

Hard work, long hours, low wages, poor living, discontent, unrest. Socialism presents itself as the remedy, with its usual indifference as to faith and morality, or rather its fierce attacks on them. The inevitable strike occurs, and the usual unscrupulous means to break it are used, including all that power which wealth exercises over corrupt politicians. The clash which in the beginning is between capital and labor finally becomes a conflict between the owner of the mill and the leader of his workmen.

The story is principally a description of this strike, and it is a tragedy. There is practically no relief from the tension from beginning to end. Incidentally, there is much discussion about conditions and remedies, but there is rather a pessimistic tone throughout. One is tempted to wish that where the Church is strong, and where she is drawn into a discussion of conditions that certainly are economically and morally wrong, a more positive stand had been taken and a clearer statement made. We do not know how far the characters are taken from life, but we imagine the Governor and the leading financial power are easily recognizable.

The book is receiving very favorable notices, and the author is being hailed as the logical, as the new, Canon Sheehan. Comparisons are sometimes odious, but oftener imprudent or unwise. It might be better to take the present story on its merits and leave comparisons for the future. The story is strong, vivid, stirring, even startling. It is also thought-provoking. It ought to help very much to change conditions which are becoming more serious and more tense every day, and which are sure to be changed in the wrong way, if not in the right way.

The opinion of Maurice Francis Egan is worth quoting. He says:

"Father Maher has done a fine thing and a bold thing. Like Richard Dehan's 'A Man of Iron,' which has had such a deserved success, this book will not be popular, because it is 'light reading.' It is not 'light reading,' and not reading for those who run as they read; it is a book that can and ought to be read twice. In writing a book which neither hedges, compromises nor temporarily soothes aching wounds by soft plaster or platitudes, Father Maher has done a fine, bold thing, for we are living in a time when the art of thinking is very little practiced. Even the hardened novel reader will go through this book for the story, or rather for the interest created in the development of the characters, and later to ponder deeply on the questions presented by Father Maher—for they are presented frankly and in such a way that the heart as well as the head of the intelligent reader must be reached.

"It is the first adequate book on the tendencies of American Socialism yet written. It is not a mere polemic which may be turned into a political cry; it is not an appeal or argument of any kind—it is simply a moving picture of the causes that make men Socialists and syndicalists. The same causes that induce thousands of emigrants to leave pleasant countries—traditional homes—to throw their fate in the United States are the causes which produce what is called 'Socialism' in our country. And the main cause of all these causes is the fervent wish to live; not merely to exist. 'It is the cry of the broken man; it is the cry of the heartsick woman; it is the cry of the hungry child; it is the cry of the unborn—all crying to be let live and love,' says Father Maher, 'and they will be heard!'"

OUR PALACE WONDERFUL, OR MAN'S PLACE IN VISIBLE CREATION. By Rev. Frederick A. Houck. 12mo., pp. 175. Illustrated. Chicago: D. B. Hansen & Sons

"If one train of thinking," says Paley, "be more desirable than another, it is that which regards the phenomena of Nature with a constant reference to a Supreme Intelligent Being." This is the author's text. It was not his purpose to convert the unbeliever, but rather to confirm the believer. He has not tried to produce an exhaustive scientific treatise, but a popular manual which would interest and instruct the general reader and lead him to a knowledge of the Creator and His works.

The book presents a rough sketch' of the material universe as one complete entirety intended and preserved by the Almighty for the temporal abode of man.

Beginning with the genesis of the earth the author gradually develops a conception of the charming mechanism and harmony of visible creation, which everywhere reflects God's goodness towards man.

In the first part of his book he gives a clear and concise explanation of the false world-views which form the stock in trade of the atheist and modern unbeliever. The fundamental errors of the agnostic, pantheistic and materialistic schools are here pointed out and shattered by the logic of common sense.

After a contemplation of the earth in its genesis and present state of development, there follows a brief description of the volume, distance, number and velocity of many stars, planets and other celestial phenomena. The mental vision of the reader is focused on the material universe as a unit that may be compared with a skillfully constructed machine moving with accuracy and precision; or, again, as an immense musical instrument, attuned by the Almighty, the sweet and harmonious strains of which may be enjoyed by all who hearken to Reason and Revelation.

From the symmetry, harmony and awe-inspiring proportions of the mighty worlds and solar systems profusely scattered in space immeasurable, the author concludes that He, Who constructed "Our Palace Wonderful," can be none other than the Infinite God, "the Alpha and Omega," "the Beginning and the End of all things." That there exists a beautiful harmony between Science and Revelation is emphasized throughout the entire book, which is copiously illustrated by appropriate engravings.

THE MAKING OF WESTERN EUROPE. By *C. R. L. Fletcher*. Vol. I. (1912), pp. ix.-409; Vol. II. (1915), pp. viii.-435. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company.

The first volume of Mr. Fletcher's work appeared in 1912 and at once took rank as a most original and stimulating presentment of the fortunes of the "Children of the Roman Empire" during the seven hundred years of change and strife known as the "Dark

Ages" (300-1000). In this volume the author dealt with the break-up of the Roman Empire, the Barbarian migrations and invasions and the rising power of the Church; the growth of Islam and its effect on the Christian world; Charlemagne, the snapping of the bonds and the gradual formation of independent nations in Europe foreshadowing those of the present day.

The qualities that won for Mr. Fletcher's treatment of these topics the highest critical commendation are still more conspicuous in the second volume, which is now before us. We have not space to enter into any detailed consideration of the contents of this volume. It must suffice to say that it continues the story of the "Children of the Roman Empire" in Western Europe down to the eve of the Third Crusade, and thus bridges the gap between the gloomy close of the first millennium of the Christian era and the brilliant life of the thirteenth century which that Crusade ushered in. This period of the "First Renaissance," as the author styles it (1000-1190), is not an easy period of which to treat, for it includes the contest between the Papacy and the Empire, the Crusades, the expulsion of the Moslems from Spain and the upbuilding of France into a kingdom.

In attempting to trace the formation of the modern European nations through such a complicated epoch of their growth, the author undertook a task which demanded ability and discrimination. In performing he has displayed both. So far as we have been able to test the book, it is very well done and the best authorities have been used—only Mr. Fletcher seems inclined to rely too exclusively on the mediæval chronicles and to overlook other sources of equal importance. In these 400 pages he tells the old story of the eleventh and twelfth centuries in rather simpler form than usual and with a rare power of summary and suggestion. Doubtless many who enjoy his descriptions of the men and movements of the "First Renaissance" will not find it so easy to accept Mr. Fletcher's general attitude towards certain questions or to assent to some of his specific conclusions. But, then, the author puts forward no claim to say the last word upon any of the many topics he touches on. Moreover, he is never dull or pedantic. Taken as a whole, the present volume is a work of real value as an introduction to the study of

the "Making of Western Europe" during the period 1000-1190 A. D., and at the same time one of intense human interest. The book is provided with a good index and with several useful maps.

ST. JULIANA FALCONIERI: A Saint of the Holy Eucharist. The Story of Her Life and Work, by *Marie Conroyville*, with a Foreword by Rev. Michael J. Phelan, S. J. 12mo, cloth, 61 pages; net, 30 cents. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The story of this saint's life is told with the fascination of a romance: the purple robe of Poesy gracefully flung around what in less artistic hands would read as dry historical facts or details. The writer is master of an easy and graceful style and the rarest thoughts flow over every page in limpid transparency. Thus, while the critical taste is charmed and the intellect enriched, the spirit rises gladdened and refreshed by the aroma that exhales from the life of the Saint of the Holy Eucharist.

Most persons are familiar with the story of St. Juliana's miraculous Holy Communion on her deathbed, and many do not know anything more of her, but while that chapter of her life is most wonderful and is told by the present author, in a charming manner, it is the climax to her saintly life which must be read if its close is to be rightly understood.

THE MASS: The Holy Sacrifice with the Priest at the Altar on Sundays, Holy Days and other days of Special Observance. 16mo. 25 cents, 50 cents and \$1. New York: Home Press, 331 Madison avenue.

Up to this the faithful have had no means of following, with the priest at the altar, all the prayers and ceremonies of the Mass.

Prayer books usually contain the Ordinary of the Mass, sometimes the Epistles and Gospels, but never the other parts.

Complete missals are too bulky, expensive and complicated for the millions who hear Mass on Sundays and holy days, and yet all authorities agree that the most beautiful, most suggestive, most profitable of all prayers for Mass are the prayers of the Missal. To bring these prayers to the people—to all the people, and not to a select few only—the Rev. John J. Wynne, S. J., has compiled the present book.

It is all in English. It contains every Mass the faithful are obliged to attend, and others which they attend in large numbers—

Nuptial, Requiem, Month's Mind, Anniversary Masses; and prayers or services connected with the Mass—the Asperges, Blessing of Candles, Ashes, Palms, Benediction, Procession, Forty Hours Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, etc.

Explanation of the parts of the Mass, given as they occur, with directions for following the priest, are simple enough for all to follow.

The terminations of Collects, Secrets, Post-communions and the Introits are printed in full.

Besides being valuable as to contents, it is most attractive in form; small, compact, legible, neat, it is a book that can be easily carried in a man's pocket or a woman's bag, or that is an ornament to the hand.

Not the least remarkable feature of it is its cheapness. Although it contains nearly 500 pages, the price ranges from 25 cents to \$1.

LA PSYCHOLOGIE DE LA CONVERSION PAR TH. MAINAGE DE L'ODRE DES FRERES PRECHEURS. One volume in 16mo. (xii.-436 pages). Librairie Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris.

Brunetiere, we are told, proposed to write a psychology of conversion in order to establish that "truth does not draw to itself every reason from the same viewpoint nor religion touch every heart in the same way." This would have been to regard conversion under an interesting but restrained aspect. Father Mainage takes the subject in its entirety and treats it thoroughly. How shall souls indifferent or hostile to Catholicism become convinced of the truth of a religion of which they are ignorant or which they have even combated? This is the problem. To solve it the author regards conversion from the standpoint of all the psychological causes capable of human explanation—the inquiry of the reason, the effort of the will, the affections of the heart, social influence, the subconscious. He shows that to none of these factors can credit be given for that which forces our inquirers to seek the threshold of the Church. He adds to them a force from above which exerts itself on the intelligence and the will of the convert without violating either the one or the other. This force is that of the greatest of Jesus Christ, the invisible educator.

Such is, in a few words, the body of the book. In order to clothe it Father Mainage adds largely from autobiographic accounts of those converted by him; he utilizes equally the best work of contemporary psychology. His work, the offspring of extensive reading and careful reflection, gives to apologetics an absolutely new chapter. The priest so often called to guide in the way of truth souls who

come or return to God, it offers suggestive views capable of helping their delicate task. But at the present time—in short, where so many among us are thinking of the eternal destiny of their dear departed—this study of Father Mainage brings back most opportunely the wonders of the Divine Grace.

WAPELHORST'S COMPENDIUM SACRAE LITURGIAE. Revised according to the latest Roman Decrees. 8vo., cloth, net, \$2.50. (Postage extra.) New York: Benziger Brothers.

As a text-book of Sacred Liturgy, Wapelhorst's Compendium has not been excelled. It has all the excellences of a model text-book. It does not claim to be exhaustive nor comprehensive nor complete, but it embodies all the elements that a student of Sacred Liturgy should become acquainted with. The style is simple, clear and concise. The division and arrangement of the book show that the author's aim was brevity and clearness. This new edition has been thoroughly revised to date—an important feature of liturgical works. It is in the true sense a handbook, and in most cases will answer all questions of liturgy that come up in practice.

THE LITTLE MANUAL OF ST. RITA. By *Rev. Thomas S. McGrath*. 16mo. 50 cents. New York: Benziger Brothers.

St. Rita, especially of late, has come into the confidence of the faithful. The world over this sweet saint is besought as the Achiever of the Impossible. Father McGrath has gathered together all the prayers and devotions composed in her honor and prefaced them with a most interesting account of St. Rita's life as girl, wife, mother, widow and nun.

THE SERVICE OF THE SACRED HEART. Commentary and Meditations by *Rev. Joseph McDonnell, S. J.* 18mo., cloth; net, 35 cents. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The object of the meditations and instructions in this book is to set before the clients of the Sacred Heart a most beautiful, most logical and most touching method of paying to that Heart of Love a homage and the loving service of our own poor hearts.

FRIENDS AND APOSTLES OF THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS. Fourth to Nineteenth Century. With their Prayers and Other Devotions. By *P. F. Chandlery, S. J.* 257 pages, 18mo., cloth; net, 75 cents. New York: Benziger Brothers

The reader will find here many golden words which will supply him with abundance of holy thoughts in his visits to the Blessed Sacrament and to the altar of the Sacred Heart.

70772

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

